

***GREEK CULTS OF DEIFIED
ABSTRACTIONS***

Thesis submitted
for the degree of PhD
by

Emma J. Stafford

University College London

1998

ABSTRACT

This dissertation aims to explore the phenomenon of the worship of abstract concepts in personified form and its development in the Archaic and Classical periods. An introductory chapter surveys previous scholarly literature on the subject and covers some general theoretical issues: i) definitions; ii) problems of sources and methodology; iii) the question of the predominantly feminine gender of these figures; iv) ancient and modern theories on deified abstractions as a class. Six chapters then look at a selection of individual cults in roughly chronological sequence, each exemplifying one or more of the general questions raised by such cults. Themis provides a good example of the very “mythological” deified abstractions of the Archaic period and the problems of tracing the origins and early history of personification cults. Nemesis was probably worshipped at Rhamnous from the sixth century, but acquires unique status in the fifth from an association with the battle of Marathon; the cult of the two Nemeseis at Smyrna, I argue, is a fourth-century innovation. Peitho is often associated with rhetoric, but a survey of her cult associations in a variety of locations emphasises her erotic side, an aspect further revealed in vase-painting. These three figures all have roots in archaic literature, whereas Hygieia, though soon mythologised as daughter of Asklepios, does not appear in any medium before her arrival in Athens in 420 BC in the healing god’s wake. Her cult particularly raises the question of how seriously personifications could be taken as deities, since the concept which she embodies is so patently a human *desideratum*. Later innovations are similarly often dismissed as “mere” allegory or propaganda, as is illustrated by the case of Eirene in fourth-century Athens, most famously represented in Kephisodotos’ group of Peace holding the child Wealth, her cult introduced in response to quite specific political circumstances. The problems of correlating archaeological and literary sources are particularly acute in the case of the most “abstract”, figure to be considered, Eleos, eponymous deity of the Athenian “altar of Pity”; although the altar dates from the late sixth century, its insubstantial god is probably a later development. From these six case studies some provisional conclusions can be offered on the place of deified abstract ideas in Greek religious thought and practice.

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	5
<i>Abbreviations and Conventions</i>	7
<i>List of Illustrations</i>	9
1. Introduction: “personification as a mode of Greek thought”	13
<i>Definitions ancient and modern</i>	23
<i>Sources and methodology</i>	26
<i>The gender question</i>	45
<i>Deified abstractions as a class</i>	56
2. Themis: archaic personification and the epithet theory	66
<i>Themis in archaic literature and art</i>	67
<i>Cults of Themis</i>	70
<i>Delphi, Themis and oracles</i>	75
<i>Themis at Rhamnous</i>	78
<i>Athens and Ge Themis</i>	83
3. Nemesis: “myth into logos?”	92
<i>Hesiod’s Nemesis</i>	94
<i>Nemesis mother of Helen and the cult at Rhamnous</i>	96
<i>Rhamnous in the fifth century</i>	100
<i>Rhamnous, Athens and the Nemesis</i>	107
<i>The Nemeseis of Smyrna</i>	114
<i>Iconography of Nemesis</i>	119
4. Peitho: sex and rhetoric	123
<i>Cults of Peitho: islands and Asia Minor</i>	125
<i>Cults of Peitho: mainland Greece</i>	129
<i>Peitho and Aphrodite Pandemos at Athens</i>	136
<i>Peitho, Aphrodite and seduction</i>	146
<i>Seduction and the wedding</i>	152
5. Hygieia: “non dea sed donum Dei”?	158
<i>“Without you no one is happy”</i>	160
<i>Hygieia’s origins</i>	163
<i>Hygieia’s associates</i>	170
<i>The picture of health</i>	174

6. Eirene: propaganda and allegory	183
<i>The Athenian cult of Peace</i>	184
<i>Kephisodotos' Eirene and Ploutos</i>	190
<i>The tradition of Peace and Prosperity</i>	194
<i>Euripides' and Aristophanes' Peace</i>	196
<i>Outside Athens</i>	203
 7. Eleos: the Athenian “altar of Pity” and its god	207
<i>Literary sources</i>	208
<i>Archaeological evidence and identification of the altar</i>	222
 Conclusion	236
 Illustrations	244
 Bibliography	278

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have often felt that this thesis would never be finished, and it can only be due to the help and encouragement of a large number of friends that it has finally reached the light of day. Alan Griffiths has been a constant source of inspiration over the seven years he has supervised me, and I owe much to his constructive criticism at every level, from content and structure to the minutiae of copy-editing. In the final stages of the first version Diana Burton was helpful beyond the call of duty in commenting on draft chapters and in making Lampeter seem less far removed from the resources of London libraries. This second version has been much improved by the erudition and eye for detail of my examiners, Robert Parker and Catherine Morgan, whose criticisms and suggestions have informed a thorough over-hauling of the piece. I have also been greatly helped and encouraged in my revisions by Nick Fisher, with whom I have had many conversations about *Nemesis*, *inter alia*. Several people have been kind enough to read and comment on one or two chapters at various stages of their development (some at unreasonably short notice): Roger Brock, Pat Easterling, Keith Hopwood, Doug Lee, John North, David Noy, John Wilkins. All remaining errors and infelicities are of course entirely my own work. A great deal of the substance of this thesis has been aired in the form of papers, and I should like to thank the many audiences for their (on the whole) encouraging reception; Nick Lowe and Lin Foxhall deserve special mention for their contagious enthusiasm and extraordinary faith in me.

Most of my research has been carried out at the Institute of Classical Studies in London, and I owe a huge debt to all the library staff there, especially Sue Willetts and Paul Jackson. The ICS postgraduate work-in-progress seminar vetted most of my papers before their unveiling to outside world, and the Gordon Square Tea-Room provided endless enlightenment, references, and refreshment of spirit (as well as tea). Regular denizens in my time included Richard Alston, Mike Chappell (to whom I owe everything I know about the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*), Nicky Devlin, Rebecca Flemming, Barbara Goward, Tamar Hodos, Alan Johnston, Ruth Leader, Bob Sharples, Karen Stears, Russell Shone and Chloë Productions. For financial support during this period I should thank the British Academy, and those who saw fit to give me paid employment: the Department of Greek and Latin, UCL; the Department of

History, Birkbeck; the Department of Classics, Royal Holloway; the Ancient History Division, Leicester; and the Barbican Arts Centre (where I had time to read many books, as well as hear good music). Since October 1995 I have been based at Lampeter, where my colleagues have been almost unfailingly gracious and practical in their support, from the provision of exceptionally good computer facilities, and the lending of books, to Anne Morley's supplying of emergency chocolate. Many of my students have also helped by asking difficult questions and being polite enough to sound interested in my work. Finally, a fortnight at the British School at Athens in August 1997 allowed me to work on this second version undisturbed in congenial surroundings.

For general moral support and accommodation/food/pints at various moments of crisis I would like to thank Hin-Yan Wong and Jane and Steve Fisher-Hunt (without whose Covent Garden and Camden residences extended visits to the ICS library would have been much more difficult to arrange); Margaret Purdy, Marcus Daniels, Andrew Colski and David Hanson; Kate Gilliver, Louis Rawlings, Helen King, Helen Morales and Karen Pierce; Alexander Clark, Duncan Barker, Jim Evans and Gideon Nisbet. Over the past two years, in particular, Tony Brothers has administered much welcome G&T and sympathy, and Alex Woolf and Dave Atkinson have been astonishingly forbearing house-mates. Finally, and most importantly, my parents Sheila and John Stafford have always supported and encouraged my academic endeavours in every possible way — I cannot begin to thank them adequately. This thesis is dedicated to them and to the memory of my grandfather, Herbert Bewley, who believed that education was a Good Thing.

Lampeter, September 1998

CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

As a general policy I have included the Greek or Latin text of passages quoted as well as a translation (my own unless otherwise specified); this may at times seem cumbersome, but I hope it will be of assistance to the reader to have both the original and my interpretation to hand. I have adopted the usual compromise position over transliteration, following the Greek spelling for the most part but retaining traditional Latinisations for some familiar names, such as Thucydides. Abbreviations of ancient authors and works follow those listed in the *OCD* with some amplifications in the interests of intelligibility. Modern works other than those below are referred to by author's surname and date of publication, full details being given in the bibliography. Abbreviations of periodical titles follow *L'Année Philologique*, but I include here a few Greek periodicals not listed therein.

<i>AAA</i>	<i>Αρχαιολογικὰ Ανάλεκτα ἐξ Αθηνῶν</i>
<i>ABV</i>	Beazley, J.D. (1956) <i>Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters</i> , Oxford
<i>Add.</i> ²	Burn, L. and Glynn, R. (eds. 1989) <i>Beazley Addenda</i> , 2nd ed. Oxford
<i>AEphem</i>	<i>Αρχαιολογικὴ Εφημέρις</i>
<i>ARV</i> ²	Beazley, J.D. (1963) <i>Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters</i> , 2nd ed. Oxford
<i>CEG</i>	Hansen, P.A. (1983-9) <i>Carmina Epigraphica Graeca</i> I-II, Berlin and New York
<i>CVA</i>	<i>Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum</i>
<i>DAA</i>	Raubitschek, A.E. (1949) <i>Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis</i> , Cambridge Mass.
<i>EAA</i>	Bianchi Bandinelli, R. and Beccati, G. (eds. 1958-94) <i>Enciclopedia dell' Arte Antica Classica e Orientale</i> , Rome
<i>FGrH</i>	Jacoby, F. (1957-) <i>Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker</i> , Leiden
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>
<i>LGPN</i>	<i>A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names</i> , Oxford. Vol. I, <i>The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica.</i> , ed. Fraser, P.M. and Matthews, E., 1987. Vol. II, <i>Attica</i> , ed. Osborne, M.J. and Byrne, S.G., 1994

<i>LIMC</i>	<i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> , Zurich and Munich 1981-
<i>LSJ</i>	Liddell, Scott and Jones (1940) <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9th ed. Oxford
<i>ML</i>	Meiggs, R. and Lewis, D.M. (1988) <i>Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC</i> , rev. ed. Oxford
<i>MPG</i>	Migne, J.-P. (ed. 1875-7) <i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graecae</i> , Paris
<i>Para.</i>	Beazley, J.D. (1971) <i>Paralipomena: Additions to ABV and to ARV²</i> , Oxford
<i>PCG</i>	Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (eds. 1984-9) <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , Berlin
<i>PEG</i>	Bernabé, A. (ed. 1996) <i>Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum</i> , 2nd ed. Leipzig
<i>PMG</i>	Page, D.L. (ed. 1962) <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> , Oxford
<i>PMG²</i>	Davies, M. (ed. 1991) <i>Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I</i> , Oxford
<i>Praktika</i>	<i>Πρακτικά της εν Αθηναις αρχαιολογικής εταιρείας</i>
Prott-Ziehen	Prott, J. de and Ziehen, L. (1896) <i>Leges Graecorum Sacrae e titulis collectis</i> , Leipzig 1896
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> , Stuttgart 1950-
<i>RE</i>	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopaedie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , Stuttgart 1893-1972
Roscher	Roscher, W.H. (1902-9) <i>Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie</i> , Leipzig
<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> , Leiden 1923-
<i>SGDI</i>	Collitz, H. et al. (eds. 1884-1915) <i>Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften</i> , Göttingen
<i>SIG³</i>	Dittenberger, W. (1915-24) <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , 3rd ed. Leipzig

ILLUSTRATIONS

(pp.244-77)

- Fig. 1** Three Nymphs, Themis and Cheiron in the wedding procession of Peleus and Thetis. Upper frieze of black-figure dinos by Sophilos, c.580 BC, British Museum (Shapiro 1993, fig. 179).
- Fig. 2** Gigantomachy: Themis drives Dionysos' chariot. North frieze of the Siphnian Treasury, Delphi, c.530-25 BC (Shapiro 1993, fig. 180).
- Fig. 3** Aigeus consults Themis, acting as the Pythia. Tondo of red-figure cup by the Codrus Painter, 440-30 BC, Berlin (Shapiro 1993, fig. 182).
- Fig. 4** Themis welcomes Bendis. Red-figure skyphos, 430-25 BC, Tübingen (Shapiro 1993, fig. 185).
- Fig. 5** Themis, seated on an omphalos, counsels Zeus. Red-figure pelike by the Eleusinian Painter, fourth century, St. Petersburg (Shapiro 1993, fig. 183).
- Fig. 6** a) General plan of Rhamnous, showing the relationship of the sanctuary to the fortress (Petrakos 1991, fig. 2).
b) Plan of the sanctuary, showing the two temples, the fifth-century stoa and the fountain-house (Petrakos 1987, 276 fig. 6).
- Fig. 7** a) Reconstruction of the sanctuary at Rhamnous as it might have looked in the fifth century BC (Petrakos 1987, 270 fig. 2).
b) Plan of the small temple (Petrakos 1991, fig. 10).
- Fig. 8** Statue of Themis by Chairestratos, c.300-250 BC, Athens NM (Harrison 1977, pl. 43.1).
- Fig. 9** The western end of the Asklepieion terrace on the south slope of the Akropolis (Walker 1979, fig. 1).
- Fig. 10** The Akropolis and surrounding shrines and buildings in the second century AD (Travlos 1971, 71, plus locations for the shrines of Pausanias 1.22.1-3).
- Fig. 11** Despinis' reconstruction of Agorakritos' cult statue of Nemesis, showing the extant fragments (Karanastassi, etc. 1992, no. 1*).
- Fig. 12** Roman copy of Agorakritos' Nemesis, early imperial period, from Italy, Copenhagen, Glyptothek 2086 (Karanastassi, etc. 1992, no. 2a*).
- Fig. 13** Reconstruction of the front of Nemesis' base (Shapiro Lapatin 1992, fig. 1). Identities (?): 6. Helen, 7. Leda, 8. Nemesis.
- Fig. 14** Detail of the base: Nemesis (Shapiro Lapatin 1992, pl. 17 c).

- Fig. 15** Leda finds the egg, watched by Tyndareos and the Dioskouroi. Attic bell-krater from Egnatia, c.420 BC, Bonn 78.247 (Carpenter 1991, fig. 295).
- Fig. 16** a) The persuasion of Helen. Amphoriskos by the Heimarmene Painter, c.430 BC, Berlin 30036 (Ghali-Kahil 1955, pl. 8). Cf. fig. 28.
b) Details: i) Nemesis and Tyche (?); ii) Heimarmene and unidentified figure (photos: Isolde Luckert, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz).
- Fig. 17** Torch-race team process towards three goddesses. Votive relief from Rhamnous, c.330 BC. a) London BM 1953.5-30.2 + Rhamnous 530, and b) cast (Palagia and Lewis 1989, pl.49).
- Fig. 18** The two Nemeseis of Smyrna appear to Alexander. Bronze coin, issues under Marcus Aurelius, Gordian and Philip I (drawing: Levi 1979, I fig. 14).
- Fig. 19** Two Nemeseis with measuring rod and bridle. Carnelian, 2nd or 3rd cent. AD, New York, MMA 81.6.189 (Karanastassi, etc. 1992, no. 5*).
- Fig. 20** Nemeseis with measuring rod and bridle. Bronze cistophor from Smyrna, Hadrian, (Karanastassi, etc. 1992, no. 9*).
- Fig. 21** Temple front, with two Nemeseis inside. Bronze cistophor from Smyrna, Hadrian (Karanastassi, etc. 1992, no. 8*).
- Fig. 22** Nemesis with scales and wheel trampling a youth. Marble votive relief from Thessaloniki, 3rd cent. AD, Vienna, Kunsth. Mus. I 808 (Depot) (Karanastassi, etc. 1992, no. 163*).
- Fig. 23** Reconstruction of the *aedicula* of Aphrodite Pandemos on the south-west slope of the Akropolis (Simon 1983, fig. 7).
- Fig. 24** Fragment of the *aedicula*'s architrave (Simon 1983, pl. 15.1).
- Fig. 25** Aphrodite, Eros and Peitho? Detail of the east frieze of the temple of Athena Nike (Blümel 1950/1 fig. 13).
- Fig. 26** Peitho flees from the scene of the Rape of the Leukippidai. The Meidias Painter, London E224, c.420 BC (Shapiro 1993, fig. 168).
- Fig. 27** Paris abducts Helen, with Aphrodite and Peitho in attendance. Skyphos by Makron, Boston 13.186 (Ghali-Kahil 1955, pl. 4)
- Fig. 28** The Persuasion of Helen: Peitho, Helen, Aphrodite, Himeros, Paris. Amphoriskos by the Heimarmene Painter, Berlin 30036 (photos: Isolde Luckert, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz). Cf. fig. 16.

Fig. 29 Menelaos is reunited with Helen, with the assistance of Peitho, Aphrodite and Eros. Oinochoe, Vatican H 525 (Shapiro 1993, fig. 150).

Fig. 30 Wedding preparations: Aphrodite, Eros, Peitho, Harmonia, Kore, Hebe, Himeros. Epinetron by the Eretria Painter (Shapiro 1993, fig. 58).

Fig. 31 Telemachos Monument:

a) Reconstruction of the monument (Beschi 1982, fig. 2).

b) The relief, side A: reconstruction and fragment showing seated Hygieia (?). Athens NM 2477 and London BM 1920.6-161 (Beschi 1982, figs. 1 and 8).

c) Inscription (*IG* II² 4960, fr.a; Clinton 1994, fig. 1).

Fig. 32 Asklepios and family, relief from Thyreatis, Athens National Museum, c.370-60 BC (Krug 1993, fig. 50).

Fig. 33 Hygieia and the Hesperides. Meidias Painter, London E224, c.420 BC, London (Shapiro 1993, fig. 79).

Fig. 34 Hygieia flanked by Pothos and Hedylogos and Eunomia. Pyxis, manner of the Meidias Painter, c.400 BC, London (Shapiro 1993, fig. 82).

Fig. 35 Hygieia the bride. Squat lekythos, manner of the Meidias Painter, c.400 BC, London (Shapiro 1993, fig. 84).

Fig. 36 Asklepios and snake; Hygieia and worshipper? Boiotian krater, c.400 BC (Lullies 1940, pl.26).

Fig. 37 Hygieia and Asklepios? Relief, c.415 BC, Brocklesby Park (Hausmann 1948, pl.13, A 42.3)

Fig. 38 Asklepios and Hygieia (?) attend a patient. Relief, late fifth century, Piraeus (Hausmann 1948, pl.1, K 1.1)

Fig. 39 Asklepios, Hygieia (?) and worshippers. Relief, c.350 BC, Athens (Kerenyi 1956, fig. 21).

Fig. 40 Offerings for Hygieia (?) and Asklepios. Relief, Athens, c.330 BC (Kerenyi 1956, fig. 16).

Fig. 41 The Hope Hygieia. Copy of original of 400-350 BC, Malibu (Waywell 1986, pl. 47).

Fig. 42 Broadlands Hygieia. Copy of original of c.320 BC, Rhodes (Sobel 1990, pl. 11b).

Fig. 43 Kassel Hygieia: i) with portrait head (Croissant 1990, no. 40*); ii) without head and restorations (Sobel 1990, pl. 10b).

- Fig. 44** St. Bernard's Well, Edinburgh (photo: Terence Chan).
- Fig. 45** Kephisodotos' Eirene and Ploutos. Julio-Claudian copy, Munich Glyptothek 219 (Woodford 1986, fig. 224).
- Fig. 46** Panathenaic amphora of 360/59 BC from Eretria, Eretria Museum 14815 (Simon 1988, pl. 5).
- Fig. 47** Second century AD Athenian bronze coin (Simon 1986, no. 4).
- Fig. 48** Eirene follows Dionysos. Round altar at Brauron, c.420-10 BC (?), Brauron Museum 1177 (Simon 1988, pl. 2; inscription = *IG I³ 1407 bis*).
- Fig. 49** Eirene in Dionysos' retinue. Kalyx-krater, 410-400 BC, Vienna 1024 (Simon 1988, pl. 3,2).
- Fig. 50** Dionysos "loves the goddess Peace". Pelike, late fifth century, ex-Paris (Shapiro 1993, fig. 9).
- Fig. 51** Eirene of Western Lokroi. Silver stater, c. 380 BC (Simon 1988, pl. 3,1).
- Fig. 52** Pax/Tellus/Italia. Detail of panel from the Ara Pacis (Zanker 1990, fig. 135).
- Fig. 53** Pax with caduceus and cornucopia. Schaffhausen Cameo, reign of Tiberius. (Simon 1988, pl. 10,1)
- Fig. 54** Pax with cornucopia and torch. Bronze sesterce, Vespasian (Simon 1988, pl. 12,2).
- Fig. 55** Cesare Ripa's *Pace* (Simon 1988, pl.12,3).
- Fig. 56** All that is visible today of the enclosure of the altar of the Twelve Gods, with Leagros' statue base in the foreground (Camp 1992, fig. 24).
- Fig. 57** Reconstruction of the altar of the Twelve Gods (Camp 1992, fig. 23).
- Fig. 58** Plan of the Athenian Agora in the second century AD (Camp 1992, fig. 153).
- Fig. 59** Route of Pausanias around the Agora (Thompson and Wycherley 1972).
- Fig. 60** The three-figure reliefs which Thompson associates with the "altar of Pity" (Thompson 1952, pl. 17).

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION: PERSONIFICATION AS A MODE OF GREEK THOUGHT

We see that intelligence, faith, hope, virtue, honour, victory, health, concord and other things of this sort have power, but not the power of gods. For they are either properties inherent in ourselves — like intelligence, hope, faith, virtue and concord — or objects of our desire — like honour, health and victory. I see the value of these things, and I see that statues are dedicated to them. But why they should be held to possess divine power I cannot understand without further investigation.

Cicero¹

While personified figures are quite familiar to anyone versed in Western art or literature, as artistic or rhetorical devices passed on through the Classical Tradition, the idea that such abstract figures should actually be worshipped may appear even more unlikely from a late twentieth-century standpoint than it did to Cicero. Literary personifications range from such figures as Milton's Sin and Bunyan's Hope, Goodwill and Piety to Baudelaire's Ennui, or even the Death who features prominently in Terry Pratchett's fantasy Discworld novels.² Visual representations come in various forms, from the complex allegories of Renaissance painting — Cranach's *Charity*, Gherardo di Giovanni's *Combat of Love and Chastity*, La Hire's *Grammar*, and Batoni's *Time orders Old Age to destroy Beauty* — to the host of sculptural figures which decorate the nineteenth-century monuments and public buildings of many European cities;³ Britannia herself has featured on British coins from the Reformation, and is still quite literally in everyday currency on the reverse of the 50p coin.⁴ One would not, however, expect to take any of these figures seriously as real powers to be

¹ Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 3.24.61 (the speaker is the Academic Cotta): *Nam mentem fidem spem virtutem honorem victoriam salutem concordiam ceteraque huius modi rerum vim habere videmus, non deorum. aut enim in nobismet insunt ipsis, ut mens ut spes ut fides ut virtus ut concordia, aut optandae nobis sunt, ut honos ut salus ut victoria; quarum rerum utilitatem video, video etiam consecrata simulacra; quare autem in is vis deorum insit tum intellegam cum cognovero.* See below pp.56-8 on Cicero.

² *Paradise Lost* II 648-60; *The Pilgrim's Progress* (*passim*); "Au Lecteur", *Les Fleurs du Mal*; *The Colour of Magic*, etc. (1983-). The music of Hildegard of Bingen is currently enjoying something of a vogue, her *Ordo Virtutum* peopled by no fewer than nineteen personifications.

³ See Warner 1985 *passim*. On the particularly rich crop of allegorical figures in the public sculpture of Liverpool, see my forthcoming paper (Stafford 1999b).

⁴ Britannia as a symbol of the triumphant nation is a significant transformation from her earliest appearance, on a first century AD relief at Aphrodisias, as a warrior-woman at the feet of the emperor Claudius, where she represents Rome's newly subdued province. A more dignified figure, recognisably the iconographic ancestor of the one familiar today, first appears on coins of Hadrian (AD 119). See Warner 1985, 46. The British Museum postcard "Britannia on Coins" juxtaposes a bronze sestertius of Antoninus Pius (c.143-4), a penny of George III (1797) and a penny of George V (1933).

revered or propitiated — indeed, in a monotheistic culture personification is *necessarily* just a manner of speaking, or a way of giving artistic form to something intangible.⁵ It might come as a surprise, then, to discover that amongst the many personifications which people ancient Greek art and literature, a number were indeed apparently worshipped — that is to say they had altars, temples and cult statues, they received sacrifices and more lasting dedications, and they were invoked in hymns and prayers. The extent to which these trappings of cult can be taken to indicate belief in the real “divine power” of the kind of figures about whom Cicero is so sceptical will be the subject of this thesis.

Various categories of non-human things in ancient Greece were at one time or another represented in human form, and in some cases worshipped: geographical features, especially rivers and springs (e.g. Acheloos, Arethousa); countries, islands and cities (e.g. Hellas, Delos, Thebes); natural phenomena (e.g. Nyx, Selene). What will concern me here, however, are cults of abstract ideas — of ethical qualities, political ideals, social goods, states of being. While such a division is very much a modern categorisation, it is obviously useful in limiting the material under discussion, and has some justification insofar as the personification of abstract concepts requires “the additional intellectual leap of imagining the invisible and intangible in physical form”.⁶ Moreover, geographical/political entities are likely to be restricted to specific localities, while the worship of natural phenomena in human form is likely to be a development from earlier forms of nature-worship/animism, considerations which require discussion beyond the scope of this thesis.⁷ On similar grounds I have also largely avoided the various female groups who appear in Greek mythology — the Furies, Seasons, Fates and Graces — whose collective nature seems to merit separate discussion.⁸

⁵ Johnson on the personifications of Fame and Victory: “to give them any real employment or ascribe to them any material agency is to make them allegorical no longer, but to shock the mind by ascribing effects to non-entity” (*Life of Milton*, quoted in Bloomfield 1963, 167).

⁶ Shapiro 1993, 27; my definition of “abstract” is broader than Shapiro’s, however (see below). Cf. Pottier’s ten categories of conceptual type (1889-90), Papadaki-Angelidou’s twelve (1960), and Gardner’s three (Foucart et al. 1917, 793).

⁷ Smith (1997, 17-18) points out that this dichotomy is first apparent in Roscher’s mythological *Lexicon* (1902-9), where Deubner’s entry on personifications of abstract concepts is distinct from Steuding’s on “Lokalpersonifikationen”. See Ostrowski (1990, 15-21) for bibliography on local personifications in ancient art.

⁸ The Furies feature largely in Aellen 1994; for a slightly convoluted discussion of their status, see especially 82-90, “La Furie est-elle une personnification?”.

Cults of deified abstractions raise a number of general questions, which can perhaps be formulated under a number of (interrelated) headings:

i) Origins

How does a personification cult arise? Are there any necessary preconditions, such as the figure's prior appearance in literature or art, or association with an Olympian deity? What historical circumstances give such a cult the impetus to develop?

ii) Status

How were deified abstractions seen in relation to other gods: did they have the same status in the belief system or were they recognised as somehow more "intellectual"? Is any such difference in status reflected in different forms of worship? Did personification cults perhaps appeal especially to the educated upper classes? Is there something more "artificial" and "arbitrary" about personifications whose cults were introduced in the late fifth or fourth centuries, as opposed to those who have a place in early literature? Is Eirene, for example, any less "real" a goddess than Nemesis?

iii) Conceptual categories

What ideas attained deified status, and are any conceptual categories better represented than others? Does the presence of particular personification cults give a fair indication of the values which were held to be of special significance for the community at the time? Or is our evidence too scattered to establish such patterns?

iv) Relationship between cult personifications, art and literature

Were the distinctions between an abstract noun, its personification in art/literature and its deification clearly felt? What implications does the presence of a local cult have for our understanding of a figure's appearance in art or literature, and indeed for the use of the abstract noun?

v) Myth v. *logos*

The very existence of cults of deified abstractions is surely an excellent crystallisation of the "myth into *logos*?" debate, since the concepts represented are, at least at first sight, quite in tune with "rational" thought, whereas their divine incarnations are necessarily "mythological". Does their development shed any light on the wider issue of the development of logical thought?⁹

⁹ Personification cults were a notable omission from the colloquium *Myth into Logos?* held at Bristol, 24th-27th July 1996; see the forthcoming proceedings (ed. Buxton).

Greek personifications in general, and particularly their incarnations in visual media, have received a good deal of scholarly attention in the last hundred years. Several works on personification cults appeared in the first two decades of this century. Deubner's article "Personifikationen abstrakter Begriffe", in Roscher's *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie* (1902-9), sets out to give an overview of personification, both Greek and Roman, in all its aspects, under the headings Cult, Myth, Poetry and Art, concluding with a list of epigraphic, literary and numismatic evidence for over ninety Greek and fifty Roman cults of personified abstractions. For the most part Deubner merely states the evidence, with little comment, and the list of testimonia gives very few indications of chronology, nor of the relative reliability of the evidence, but a vast amount is covered in the space, and the interdisciplinary approach makes this fundamental for later studies. Farnell disposes of cults of deified abstractions in a few pages at the end of the final chapter of *Cults of the Greek States* (1896-1909, V.xi), after cults of natural phenomena and localities; he too supplies a list of testimonia, which agrees substantially with Deubner's though including fewer than half as many deities. Roman cults receive more detailed consideration in Axtell's *The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions* (1907), which discusses public and private worship of individual personifications, as well as dealing with issues relevant to deified abstractions as a class. Ten years later Greek and Roman cults are put into a broader theoretical framework in the entry "Personification" in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (1917), by Foucart and others, which also covers the phenomenon in Egyptian, Indian and Semitic contexts.

Subsequent encyclopedia entries on "Personifikation" by Stöbl in *Paulys Real-Encyclopaedie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1937), and Pötscher in *Der Kleine Pauly* (1972) do little to add to Deubner. Nilsson's 1952 article "Kultische Personifikationen", however, a postscript to his *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, makes a serious attempt to tackle the theoretical issues raised by abstract deities as a class, focussing especially on the question of how they came about. A more general overview of "Personification as a Mode of Greek Thought" is provided by Webster's 1954 article, while the relationship between cult personifications and allegorical figures is the focus of Reinhardt's essay "Personifikation und Allegorie" (1966). The most

extensive treatment specifically of Greek cults is Hamdorf's *Griechische Kultpersonifikationen der Vorhellenistischen Zeit* (1964), which does great service to the subject by drawing attention to the large number of cults attested before the Hellenistic period. Hamdorf covers natural phenomena and local personifications as well as abstractions, accompanying each section with a catalogue of testimonia. The main drawback to Hamdorf's work is that the large amount of material covered leaves space for only brief discussion of each figure, often obscuring the very different standards of evidence adduced, and few general conclusions are reached; it is best consulted as a starting point for further investigations. A return to the broader theoretical approach can be seen in Gombrich's 1971 article "Personification" in Bolgar's *Classical Influences on European Culture AD 500-1500*, which relates the Greek precedent to the "ubiquitous habit of personification" in medieval and early Renaissance art and literature. Similarly, the colloquium held in Paris in 1977 on *Mythe et Personification* had papers considering the phenomenon in Scandinavian, Renaissance Spanish, and modern Greek literature as well as in Greek and Roman mythology, and the proceedings (ed. Duchemin 1980) attempt to arrive at a general definition of "mythical personification". The search for a universally applicable explanation of Greek personification cults recurs in Humphreys' "Dynamics of the Greek breakthrough: the dialogue between philosophy and religion" (1986), which places the phenomenon in the context of a more general rationalising trend. An attempt to combine theory with more detailed examination of individual cases can be seen in Kershaw's dissertation *Personification in the Hellenistic World: Tyche, Kairos, Nemesis* (1986), which considers each figure in the light of literary usage of the abstract concept, as well as its iconography and evidence for cult. Personification cults feature briefly in two standard general works on religion, just two pages in Burkert's *Greek Religion* (1985, 85-6), but a more substantial section in Parker's *Athenian Religion: a History* (1996, 227-37). A paper delivered by Nicolas Richer at the recent conference *Sparta: New Perspectives* (Hay-on-Wye, September 1997), "Innovations à Sparte à l'époque archaïque: les *pathèmata* et leur évolution", makes a bold attempt to date a number of personification cults known from later sources to the seventh/sixth century on the basis of conducive social conditions demonstrated by archaic Spartan art and literature. Richer's arguments are admittedly highly

speculative, but his approach is salutary, with its focus on the attempt to explain a group of personified abstractions worshipped in a particular *polis* in terms of that city's social history.¹⁰

Much work has focussed on personification in the visual arts, often raising issues of interest to the current study.¹¹ Hinks' seminal *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art* (1936) is much concerned with theoretical questions beyond the strictly iconographic, especially the "mythical thought v. logical thought" question. Three recent studies, however, give the images centre-stage, combining useful catalogues with more or less extensive discussion. Alan Shapiro's *Personifications in Greek Art: the representation of abstract concepts 600-400 BC* (1993, based on a 1977 Princeton dissertation) provides an A-Z of personified figures in the sixth and fifth centuries BC. Attic vase-painting inevitably makes up the bulk of his material, but he does also catalogue lost works known from literary sources, and discusses each figure in the light of evidence for her cult; his entries provided a starting point for all but one of the figures on which the current work focusses. Published in the same series, Christian Aellen's *À la Recherche de l'Ordre Cosmique: forme et fonction des personnifications dans la céramique italote* (1994) is concerned solely with personifications in fourth-century South Italian vase-painting. Aellen gives much consideration to questions of definition — how personifications relate to other mythological figures — and the function of personifications in the scenes in which they appear, but his discussion keeps mostly within the terms of the literary and iconographic tradition, only rarely making reference to cult practice or any other facets of the historical context in which the images were created. Amy Smith's dissertation *Political Personifications in Classical Athenian Art* (Yale 1997), however, covers some of the same ground as Shapiro, but adds local personifications and continues the investigation into the fourth century. Smith eschews the catalogue approach in favour of a chronological one, with three chapters each covering a 50-year period (480-431, 431-378, 378-322 BC), which,

¹⁰ This is due to appear in English translation in the conference proceedings (Richer forthcoming).

¹¹ For a summary of pre-1900 works see Smith 1997, 16-17, or Aellen 1994, 14.

along with the focus on a particular *polis*, enables her to relate individual figures closely to their political context.¹²

Personified natural phenomena and localities have been the subject of a number of recent studies. Neuser's *Anemoi: Studien zur Darstellung der Winde und Windgottheiten in der Antike* (1982) focusses on the iconography of the winds, with a chapter on their place in cult. Weiss' *Griechische Flussgottheiten in Vorhellenistischer Zeit* (1984) considers representations of river gods in literature and various visual media, especially coins, while Brewster's *The River Gods of Greece: myths and mountain waters in the Hellenic world* (1997) is a more popular survey of rivers and their divine incarnations, lavishly illustrated with photographs of the modern Greek landscape. Roman as well as Greek rivers are covered in Ostrowski's *Personifications of Rivers in Greek and Roman Art* (1991), though not in great depth; the question of whether representations of rivers in human form should be regarded as gods or as personifications is considered in the introduction. Ostrowski is also the author of *Les Personifications des Provinces dans l'Art Romain* (1990), which provides a brief survey of the representation of local personifications in Greek art as a background to the personified Roman provinces under consideration.¹³

In addition to these works on various groupings, individual personified figures have received extensive treatment in recent years in the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (1981-). Although the focus is obviously on iconography, each entry begins with a summary of the figure's place in literature and gives some indication of her/his place in cult, with questions of status sometimes receiving further discussion in the commentary which follows the catalogue of images. A few deified abstractions have also been the subject of recent monographs, including two whom I consider below: Corsano's *Themis: la noma e l'oracolo nella Grecia antica* (1988) is mainly concerned with the goddess' role in literature, relating her fortunes to those of the concept she represents;¹⁴ Sobel's *Hygieia: die Göttin der Gesundheit* (1990) provides some commentary on her cult, although the focus is on her iconography, with

¹² This dissertation came to my attention on its completion in 1997; I am grateful to Amy Smith for sharing her work with me since then.

¹³ Cf. Marshall 1997 on the personifications of Cyrene and Libya, who, along with the oecist Battus, functioned as symbols of civic identity in Roman Cyrene.

¹⁴ See further below p.66 n.1 for studies of Themis.

a catalogue of representations. Nike and Erôs, two figures excluded from Shapiro's catalogue,¹⁵ have received some coverage since. Mark's *The Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: architectural stages and chronology* (1993) discusses the cult as well as more technical architectural matters, the study arising from a New York dissertation (1979).¹⁶ Erôs' status as deity is discussed in relation to the philosophical tradition in Osborne's *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the god of love* (1994), while a chapter of Thornton's more popular synthesis on ancient attitudes to love and sex, *Eros: the myth of ancient Greek sexuality* (1997), is devoted to Erôs' divine incarnations in literature.¹⁷ Wöhrle's *Hypnos, der Allbezwinger: eine Studie zum literarischen Bild des Schlafes in der griechischen Antike* (1995) is a thorough survey of Hypnos' appearances in Greek literature and ancient attitudes towards sleep, with a few pages on his cult.¹⁸ The most complete recent account of any single personified abstraction's cult is Gaetan Thériault's *Le Culte d'Homonoia dans les cités grecques* (1996), which examines all the possible sources, primarily epigraphic and numismatic, for Homonoia's cult in the Greek world. Each one of five chapters takes a particular aspect of *homonoia* — within the city, between cities, "the *homonoia* of the Hellenes", *homonoia* in the family, and Roman imperial *concordia* — and discusses the concept in general to provide a context for the individual cult attestations which follow, each complete with translation and commentary. I shall return to Thériault's conclusions below.

Ancient personifications in general, then, have attracted much interest of late, more than a dozen of the works just mentioned having been published in the 1990s.¹⁹

¹⁵ Nike on the grounds that she is practically inseparable from Athena in sixth- and fifth-century Athens, Erôs because he "would require a separate monograph": Shapiro 1993, 27-9.

¹⁶ See especially 1993, 94 on "the popular confusion of Athena Nike, a form of Athena, and Nike, the personification".

¹⁷ On Erôs, see below pp.50-1 and n.146.

¹⁸ See below p.51 and nn.150-2. I hope to address Hypnos' iconography and cult in a forthcoming paper.

¹⁹ Further indication of the current vogue for personification can be seen in Yale University Art Gallery's exhibition *An Obsession with Fortune: Tyche in Greek and Roman Art* (1st September-31st December 1994), accompanied by a collection of essays on Tyche (ed. Matheson 1994), and, on Renaissance personifications, the National Gallery's exhibition entitled *Themes and Variations: Ideas Personified* (28th Sept.-4th Dec. 1994), accompanied by a video of the same title. One of the new Hellenistic rooms at the British Museum (Room 14) has a panel on "Realism and Personification", which explains that Hellenistic art "demonstrates an enormous interest in the individual and in the abstract forces that were felt to shape the variety of human experience", while a nearby case displays the well known

Most recent work on deified abstractions, however, has focussed on individual figures and/or on iconography; on the phenomenon of personification cults as a whole no single extensive study has been undertaken since Hamdorf (1964). What the current work aims to provide is a synthesis dealing with the general problems associated with such cults, but approached via case-studies of just six individual figures, so that the theoretical discussion can be tested against a more thorough evaluation of the evidence than Hamdorf's catalogue-style format allows. Every one of these figures deserves to be treated at greater length — ideally each would be considered in the context of a study of the meaning and usage of the abstract noun, and of the various regional cult systems in which the personification appears.²⁰ Conversely it could quite properly be argued that a much greater number of such figures needs to be examined before any reliable conclusions can be drawn about personification cults as a class. Given the enormity of the task presented by these conflicting demands, however, what is offered here is a practical compromise.

The personified abstractions in question are Themis (Order), Nemesis (Retribution), Peitho (Persuasion), Hygieia (Health), Eirene (Peace) and Eleos (Mercy). The choice of these six has been determined by a number of factors. Firstly there is the practical consideration that their cults are relatively well attested — for the worship of many figures we have no more evidence than a single dedicatory inscription or a passing mention in Pausanias, which would provide little basis for discussion. Secondly, with the exception of Eleos, they cover a chronological spectrum from the sixth to the fourth century — personification cults have widely been held to be primarily a feature of the Hellenistic period, despite Hamdorf's demonstration to the contrary, so a study of the earlier period seems desirable.²¹ I shall of course be discussing dates of inception, but broadly speaking Themis and Nemesis are first attested in the sixth century, Peitho is largely a fifth-century phenomenon, Hygieia

bronze head of Hypnos and numerous small jewellery pieces decorated with Nikai and Erotes.

²⁰ See e.g. Buxton 1982 for the literary contextualisation of Peitho, or Richer (forthcoming) for personification cults at Sparta.

²¹ The Hellenistic period in general has some coverage from Kershaw (1986), and much of Thériault's material dates from the third and second centuries BC (1996). See also various articles in Matheson ed. 1994, especially Matheson, S.B., "The Goddess Tyche" (18-33) Broueque, P.B.F.J., "Tyche and the Fortune of Cities in the Greek World" (34-49), and Smith, A.C., "Queens and Empresses as Goddesses: the public role of the personal Tyche in the Graeco-Roman World" (86-105).

appears in the late fifth century but achieves wide popularity in the fourth, and Eirene is installed in Athens in the first half of the fourth century. Eleos is an odd case because of his almost exclusive connection with the Athenian “altar of Pity”; the altar itself dates from the late sixth century, although Eleos’ divine status is extremely problematic before the late Hellenistic period. Thirdly, my six figures represent a variety of conceptual categories — Themis and Nemesis are bound up with ideas of fate and justice, Peitho with rhetoric on the one hand, sex on the other, Hygieia with physical well-being, Eirene most obviously with politics, and Eleos with the ethics of supplication. Fourthly, each figure exemplifies to some extent one of the more general questions raised in the rest of this chapter. Just how representative a sample these six figures are must await further study, but it is to be hoped that the provisional generalising conclusions reached on the basis of this selection will provoke discussion and provide a starting point for more detailed work on both the figures considered and their fellow personifications in Greek cult.

Before turning to my case studies, however, some theoretical preliminaries are in order, which will be the subject of the remainder of this chapter. In section I I shall examine some definitions of the term “personification”, and clarify my own use of it. In section II I shall address the problems of having to work with a wide variety of evidence, often geographically and chronologically scattered as well as diverse in nature. I shall consider some problems of personification in Greek literature and art, looking particularly at the question of how, if at all, a distinction can be drawn between “allegorical” figures and “real” deities, before arriving at a set of working criteria for the identification of a personification’s cult. In section III I shall look at the much-commented-upon fact that personifications are predominantly female. Finally, in section IV, I shall survey views ancient and modern on deified abstractions as a class, and outline how the various questions raised are to be addressed in the following chapters.

I. DEFINITIONS ANCIENT AND MODERN

Personification: 1755 (f. personify) 1. *The act of personifying*, esp. as a rhetorical figure or species of metaphor; b. *an imaginary person conceived as representing a thing or abstraction* 1850. 2. *A person or thing viewed as embodying a quality, etc., or as exemplifying it in a striking manner; an incarnation* (of something) 1807. 3. *A dramatic representation, or literary description, of a person or thing* 1814.

Personify: 1727 [a.F. personifier] 1. trans. *To figure or represent* (a thing or abstraction) *as a person*, esp. in speech or writing; in art, *to symbolise by a figure in human form*. 2. *To embody* (a quality, etc.) *in one's person or self; to exemplify in a typical manner*. Chiefly in pa.pple. 1803.

Shorter OED

In general usage the terms “personification” and “personify” are most often applied in the second sense defined by the *OED*: “he was regarded as the personification of evil”, “she is grace personified”. For obvious reasons, the first, more technical usage, “representing a thing or abstraction as a person”, is largely confined to literary criticism or art history. In the context of the present study the distinction between the two is of some importance: to call Aphrodite “love personified” is to describe the goddess in terms of her major sphere of influence, as exemplifying love, whereas to label Hygieia “health personified” is simply to apply a technical term, indicating that she represents an abstraction in human form.²² It should also be noted that, as an English speaker, my understanding of personification must be affected by a fundamental difference between English and ancient Greek, and most other modern European languages: its lack of an explicit gender structure.²³ The basic distinction in English is between animate and inanimate: the neuter pronoun “it” is applied to anything inanimate, whether a concrete object or an abstract concept; the moment I assign a masculine or feminine pronoun to a “thing”, it becomes animate. “We will seek justice” brings the abstract to mind, but as soon as I add the qualification “though she is elusive” it becomes clear that Justice in human form is meant. The English term “personification” is obviously derived from the Latin *persona* + *facere*, but no Latin term exactly corresponds to the concept defined above. Instead, what does appear, in Quintilian, is the term *prosopopoeia*, a transliteration of the Greek rhetorical term προσωποποιία, of which *personae factio* would of course be the literal translation.

²² See further below pp.33-4 on interpretational allegory.

²³ Bloomfield (1963, 162) notes a number of German analyses of English literature which are fascinated by the freedom of English writers in choosing the gender of their personifications; he comments, “One might say that languages with grammatical gender, unlike English, have automatically built-in personification of some sort.”

The word seems to be of fairly late coinage and has a wider range of meanings than “personification”, though what I understand by the latter is included in the broader category.

From its first appearance in Demetrios’ *De Elocutione* προσωποποιία is used in analyses of literary and rhetorical style in the sense of “putting speeches into characters’ mouths”, as opposed to maintaining authorial narrative, a basic meaning which it retains throughout antiquity.²⁴ It is employed to designate “dramatisation” in comparisons of Thucydides’ and Herodotus’ style by Dionysios of Halikarnassos and Marcellinus, and similarly by Athanasius and John Chrysostom in exegeses of the *Septuagint*.²⁵ Clement of Alexandria implies “characterisation” by his application of the term to a parable in Luke, a shade of meaning emphasised by Origen in his refutation of Celsus, where he uses it of both the process of characterisation and of the resulting speeches given to a character.²⁶ In rhetorical treatises, however, προσωποποιία has a broader definition, with the general idea of speaking in the voice of a character not actually present, whether real or imaginary. Suitable subjects include dead ancestors and countries as well as abstract concepts, like Demosthenes’ Kairos (*Olynthiac* I.2); some distinguish between imaginary, generic characters and real people, or specify that any real person represented should not be living at the time; the figure is an effective vehicle for feeling and useful for making a point memorable.²⁷ The earliest Latin rhetorician refers to the figure as *conformatio*, including “people not

²⁴ *De Elocutione* 265. On the grounds of internal evidence, Roberts (1902 ed.) favoured a first-century AD date, but more recently earlier dates have been argued for, c.270 BC or second century BC; see D.C. Innes’ introduction to the latest Loeb translation (1995, 312-14).

²⁵ Dionysios, *De Thucydide* 37 (on Thuc. 5.85) and *De Imitatione* 2.3; Marcellinus *Vita Thuc.* 38, ed./tr. Piccirilli (1985); Athanasius, *MPG* 27.188B (on Psalm 38); Chrysostom, *In Job Sermo* III, *MPG* 56.572D (cf. *De Cruce et Latrone* 10.9).

²⁶ Clement, on Luke 12.16-20, *Stromata* 3.6.56.3 (ed. Stählin 1906; Origen, *Contra Celsum* (ed. Borret 1967) especially 7.36.19-21, but also P.6.2, 1.32.1, 1.34.1, 1.49.11, 1.50.15, 1.71.23, 2.1.3, 2.1.13 (cf. *In Jeremiam* 5.10.3, *Fragmenta in Lamentationes* 41.5, *Commentum in Epistulam ad Romanos* 41.4, *Fragmenta in Psalmos* 37.17.19).

²⁷ The most extensive analysis of the term comes in Aelius Theon’s *Progymnasmata*, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Graec.* II, 115.11-28, 117.30-2 (cf. 60.22-30, 68.21-3). The example of Demosthenes’ Kairos is cited in discussions by Alexander Rhetor in his *De Figuris* (Spengel III, 19.14-20) and Apsines of Gadara in his *Ars Rhetorica* (Spengel I², 299.6-12). Aischines’ *Against Timarchos* (1.128-30) introduces a deified abstraction as just such a law-court witness (although she is not represented as actually speaking): “The city and our ancestors founded an altar of Pheme, as being a great goddess... If I had presented witnesses about an individual, you would have believed me. Will you then disbelieve me, if I cite the goddess as witness...?”; see below n.54, and cf. *On the Embassy* 145. On the memorability of personifications, cf. the *imagines agentes* of the “art of memory”, on which see Yates’ fascinating book (1966).

present” as well as “mute things” as characters to be represented.²⁸ Cicero describes the figure, under devices for amplification, as *personarum ficta inductio*, but seems to have no proper term for it.²⁹ Quintilian coins the transliteration *prosopopoeia* and uses it, in the broadest sense of the Greek word, of “representation of characters”, but his examples do include such well known personifications as Vergil’s Rumour, his longest treatment of the device coming in a list of figures for intensifying emotion.³⁰ That giving words to inanimate things is any different from giving them to imaginary people seems not to have been strongly felt. Quintilian comments that “there are some who” apply the term προσωποποιία only to cases where a body as well as words has to be imagined (personification proper), calling imaginary human conversations διαλόγοι or *sermocinatio* (ἡθοποιία), but the only extant writers to draw such a distinction explicitly are Hermogenes of Tarsus and Priscian.³¹

The absence of specific discussion of personification in the modern technical sense in the majority of ancient texts, despite the wide occurrence of the phenomenon, would suggest that there was no distinct concept in Classical thought. It might even seem that incarnations of abstractions and inanimate things were not generally recognised as distinct from any other kind of imaginary people, or from people who were real, but intangible because dead and buried. It has to be noted, too, that all occurrences of the term προσωποποιία refer to speech put into a character’s mouth, either in the context of dialogue within a historical narrative or in that of adopting various *personae* within a public speech. Theoretical discussion of personification confines its material to rhetorical and literary style, making no link with artistic representations or cults of personifications.

For the purposes of this dissertation, I shall restrict myself to a narrow definition of “personification” as a technical term, meaning an anthropomorphic

²⁸ *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.53.66.

²⁹ *De Oratore* 3.5.204-5.

³⁰ Quint. 9.2.29 ff., cf. 1.8.3, 2.1.2, 3.8.49, 6.1.25, 11.1.41. The only other extant Latin writer to use the term *prosopopoeia* is Pomponius Porphyrio, who applies it to designate the form of Horace Odes I 28 (*Comm. in Hor. Carm.* I.28.pr.).

³¹ Quint. 9.2.31; Hermogenes 9.1-7, ed. Rabe; Priscian, *Praeexercitamina Rhetorica* 9.27 (ed. Keil III, 437.29-438.1). Priscian elsewhere raises the seldom noted point that, while the third person can apply equally well to both animate and inanimate, the first and second imply some degree of personality; application of the latter to an inanimate subject therefore automatically personifies it (*Institutiones Grammaticae* 12.6.18, Keil II, 587.22-25). See Lausberg (1990, 407-13) the *sermocinatio/fictio personae* distinction.

representation of any non-human thing.³² I am primarily concerned with the personification of abstract ideas, taking “abstract” in the general sense of “non-concrete” — ideas indicating a quality, a state of being, an emotion. I include in my definition a number of characters who have some mythological role: figures such as Themis, Erôs and Hebe are so well established on Olympos that they might be thought hardly to count as personifications at all. The critical point, however, is that, unlike the names of Zeus, Hera and the rest of the Olympians, θέμις, ἔρως and Ἥβη are used as abstract nouns throughout antiquity.³³ We have become so accustomed to these words as gods’ names that as often as not we leave them untranslated, making a distinction between deity and concept which would not have been perceived so sharply by a native speaker of ancient Greek.³⁴ Whether or not a particular personified abstraction is a god is of course a question that I shall be concerned with throughout. I take “personification” to be the general, all-embracing category, but by the term “deified abstraction” I shall be implying that a personified concept has demonstrable cult status.³⁵

II SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

The sources available for the study of Greek cults of deified abstractions are dauntingly diverse in nature, provenance and time. What might be considered the most “direct” evidence comes from material remains, especially inscriptions recording dedications or regulations concerning the worship of personified figures, and from the testimony of antiquarians, geographers and lexicographers writing of altars, cult statues and *aitia* for local rituals in honour of personifications. Our information on a particular figure may be concentrated on a specific location, as in the case of the

³² Cf. Bloomfield’s definitions of “true personification”, which he distinguishes from various related forms of “pseudo-personification” (1963, 163-4).

³³ Shapiro (1993, 14) likewise takes the occurrence of the divinity alongside the abstract noun as qualification for the title “personification, in that she (or occasionally he) was felt to embody the essence of the abstraction”. Cf. Gardner’s definition in Hastings ed. 1917, 792-3.

³⁴ Hebe’s role as wife to Herakles, symbolising his immortality, may be a post-Homeric development (*Od.* 11.602-4 being recognised as an interpolation even in antiquity) but the pair are shown in a chariot, flanked by other gods, as early as the seventh century on an unpublished Orientalising krater from Samos (*LIMC* s.v. “Herakles” 3330). See Burton 1996 chs. 1.3 and 4.5 on Herakles’ immortal (or otherwise) status, and Laurens 1988 on Hebe. Cf. Sarian 1990 and Angiolillo 1992 on Hestia.

³⁵ Reinhardt (1966, 9) is begging the question by applying “deification” more generally.

Athenian Eleos, but is more often geographically scattered, with perhaps a dedication from Paros here and a Pausanian reference to Megara there. Rarely can any kind of chronological continuity be established, either, huge gaps intervening between the few notices we have, and, as always in the study of Greek religion, there is the problem of explicit commentary being largely confined to sources writing centuries after the event. The sparsity of direct testimonia means that material from literature and art needs to be brought into play to answer even the most basic questions about such cults: Greek poetry from Homer and Hesiod onwards is thronged with personifications, they are legion in extant sculpture and painted pottery, and we hear of yet more in descriptions of such lost works as the Chest of Kypselos. With such material, however, there is always the question of status — can a poetic or visual representation of a personification be taken as evidence for the figure's existence in cult, or is it just a matter of “artistic licence”? Since I am dealing with such a wide range of material, it is perhaps particularly important to be aware from the start of the problems inherent in various categories of evidence, and explicitly to outline the methodology which underlies the presentation of material in the chapters which follow. I shall, then, briefly survey some general questions about personification in poetic literature and art, including the related phenomenon of interpretational allegory, before considering the more “direct” sources for cults of deified abstractions.

PERSONIFICATION IN GREEK LITERATURE AND ART: THE “STATUS QUESTION”

Accomplished craftsmen... represent not only the various gods in human forms, but everything else as well, sometimes painting rivers as men and springs in certain feminine forms, and islands and cities, and practically everything else, just as Homer dared to represent the Skamandros speaking beneath the flood, and though they cannot give voices to their figures, they do give them forms and symbols appropriate to their nature...³⁶

The desire to distinguish between “artistic” personifications and “real” cult figures seems to have troubled most commentators on the subject, and various attempts have been made to address this “status question”. Stöbl distinguishes three

³⁶ Dio Chrysostom *Oratio* 4.85: οἱ κομψοὶ τῶν δημιουργῶν... οὐ μόνον τὰς τῶν θεῶν ἀπομιμούμενοι φύσεις ἀνθρωπίνους εἶδουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστον, ποταμούς τε ἐνίοτε γράφοντες ἀνδράσιν ὁμοίους καὶ κρήνας ἐν τισὶ γυναικείοις εἶδεσι, νήσους τε καὶ πόλεις καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μικροῦ δεῖν ξύμπαντα, ὅποιον καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐτόλμησεν ἐπιδείξαι Σκάμανδρον φθεγγόμενον ὑπὸ τῇ δίνῃ, κάκεῖνοι φωνὰς μὲν οὐκ ἔχουσι προσθεῖναι τοῖς εἰδώλοις, εἶδη δὲ οἰκεῖα καὶ σημεῖα ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως...

steps, from “pure abstraction” to fully individualised divinity; Webster outlines a scale of decreasing vividness, from deification via strong and weak personification to technical terms; Pötscher distinguishes between personification proper (the poetic) and “Person-Bereichdenken” (the religious), subdividing the latter into four categories, from those with “ausgeprägtem Persönlichkeitscharakter” to those with scarcely any personality; Kershaw favours a “sliding scale” and draws attention to the fact that any one personification may appear at several points along it.³⁷ Evidence of cult might be taken as an important criterion for establishing a figure’s place on the “reality” scale, although, as Aellen quite properly points out, it is difficult to generalise when our cult evidence is so scattered in terms of place and time.³⁸ We might question the usefulness of the whole exercise, which betrays such an academic preoccupation with categorisation, and obscures the point that any one figure may have been regarded differently in different places and times. Rather than attempting to define a figure’s exact status on an imaginary scale, it might be more helpful to take a broad overview of her/his incarnations in various media to gain a general indication of more or less widespread recognition.

Literature

The first problem with literary personification is technical: in a language which makes no formal distinction between animate and inanimate, and which has no such convention as the initial capital for a proper name, where can the line be drawn between an abstract noun and its personification? At the least explicit end of the scale, a noun can be described as personified if it is qualified by a verb or adjective denoting human action, feeling or status, a use of personifying language which might be termed “light personification”.³⁹ Some authors are more prone to it than others, but it can be found in a diversity of genres (prose as well as poetry), indicating how deeply embedded in Greek thought is the tendency to conceive of things in human terms. The

³⁷ Stöbl (1937); Webster (1954); Pötscher (1972); Kershaw (1986, ch.1, 1-14). Cf. Willcock (1970, 3) on divine action in the *Iliad*, on a scale from “little more than a figure of speech” to “totally independent agent”, and 1977 on “Augenblickserfindung” or “autoschediasma” in the *Iliad*.

³⁸ Aellen 1994, 173 n.2.

³⁹ Cf. Webster (1952a, 28), who includes this in his criteria for recognising a figure as personified.

topic deserves fuller treatment, but a handful of examples will illustrate the principle. The adverb *dikaiôs* implies that the subject is acting according to human ethics: “vengeance does not succeed fairly”,⁴⁰ while the application of the qualification *sophos* to a plant is clearly humorous: “the wood of the vine is clever”.⁴¹ The verb *homilein* usually denotes human social intercourse, but can relate abstract ideas to the concrete world: “battle against the stronger is hard company for men”,⁴² “you consort with good fortune”.⁴³ Similarly the verb *hepomai*, used primarily of people, “to follow” or “to attend (as a servant)”, is striking when applied to abstracts: “may daring and wide-spreading power attend me”,⁴⁴ “let persuasion follow, and success in action”.⁴⁵ One can be “captured” (*haliskomai*) by death, madness, weariness or love,⁴⁶ “words are the healers of the disease of anger”, “ageing time teaches everything”.⁴⁷ Within this category of light personification I would also place the figure of apostrophe, which implies personification by putting its object in the place of the human audience, and imbuing it with sufficient personality to be addressed.⁴⁸

More obviously personifying is the presence of a genealogy, used to convey close relationships between concepts. The whole of Hesiod’s *Theogony* is based upon more or less significant genealogical relationships, from Memory as mother of the Muses to Strife, mother of Toil, Famine, Sorrows, Slaughter, Lawlessness and the rest.⁴⁹ Duchemin explains Hesiod’s partiality for personifications at least in part as a

⁴⁰ Thuc. 4.62.4: τιμωρία γὰρ οὐκ εὐτυχεῖ δικαίως. See Smith 1918 for a catalogue of examples from Thucydides.

⁴¹ Eur. *Cyc.* 572: σοφόν γε τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου.

⁴² Pind. *N* 10.72-3: χαλεπὰ δ’ ἔρις ἀνθρώποις ὁμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων.

⁴³ Eur. *Or.* 354: εὐτυχία δ’ αὐτὸς ὁμιλεῖς.

⁴⁴ Pind. *O.* 9.82-3: τόλμα δὲ καὶ ἀμφιλαφῆς δύναμις ἔσποιτο.

⁴⁵ Aisch. *Suppl.* 523: πειθὼ δ’ ἔποιτο καὶ τύχη πρακτήριος.

⁴⁶ Hom. *Il.* 21.281: νῦν δέ με λευγαλέω θανάτῳ εἴμαρτο ἀλῶναι. Soph. *Aj.* 216: μανία γὰρ ἄλλους. Thuc. 7.40.4: κόπῳ ἀλίσκεσθαι. Plato *Phaed.* 252c: ὑπ’ ἔρωτος ἀλῶσι.

⁴⁷ *PV* 377: ὀργῆς νοσοῦσης εἰσιν ἱατροὶ. *PV* 981: ἀλλ’ ἐκδιδάσκει πάνθ’ ὁ γηράσκων χρόνος.

⁴⁸ Quintilian (9.2.31) makes the point that it is impossible to conceive of speech without conceiving it to be spoken by a person, so the figure of *prosopopoiia* (in this case personification in a strict sense) is necessary to make acceptable the attribution of words to inanimate things. See Chappell 1991 on apostrophe in Homer and Pindar, and Frye 1957, 249 ff. Cf. the standard signature formulas inscribed on vases and statue bases, “X made/painted *me*”, and the boundary stones of the Athenian Agora: ὅρος εἰμι..., on which see Ober 1995 and Oliver 1998.

⁴⁹ *Theog.* 915-7, 226-32; see West (1966, 34-7) on Hesiod’s “family planning”. See below p.68 on the daughters of Themis (*Theog.* 901-6) and p.94 on the children of Night (*Theog.* 211-225). Buxton (1994, 15) comments: “Erecting an artificial barrier between the mythical and non-mythical in Hesiod — a barrier between Dike (‘Right’) and *dikê* (‘right’), or between Pandora and womankind — travesties the poet’s thought.”

result of his project to present a unified picture, in honour of Zeus, out of very diverse source material, with personifications used to create links between disparate elements; she also points to the influence of Near Eastern genealogies on the *Theogony*.⁵⁰ The lyric poets likewise use genealogies to express relationships, or to exalt an abstract concept by association with divine parentage. Alkman makes Lawfulness sister of Persuasion and daughter of Forethought.⁵¹ Bacchylides even invents a special genealogy for the first day of the Olympic festival: “O radiant daughter of Time and Night, you, the sixteenth day of the fiftieth month at Olympia...”⁵² Herakleitos develops the device as a central principle for his cosmology — “War is father of all and king of all” — as well as using personifications in a number of striking phrases to express his view of cosmic order — “The Sun will not transgress his measures. If he does, the Furies, ministers of Justice, will find him out”, “Lifetime is a child at play, moving pieces in a game. Kingship belongs to the child”.⁵³

A further stage is represented by statements which explicitly attribute deity to an abstract idea. Hesiod’s PHEME is an early example: “No rumour wholly dies that many people rumour; she too is somehow a goddess”.⁵⁴ Euripides, however, provides some of the most startling uses of the trope. The Cyclops’ assertion that “Wealth is the only god for the wise; the others are boasts and fine forms of words” characterise

⁵⁰ Duchemin 1980. She distinguishes between two categories of Hesiodic personification, that of abstract ideas, the “intellectual”, and that of natural phenomena, the “primitive”; she takes the latter to be a development from animism, the former to be “le produit de l’esprit humain” (1). She takes a fairly optimistic view of the status question: “il a toujours été vraisemblable... que les divinités énumérées dans la *Théogonie* avaient eu en quelque lieu des fidèles et des clergés pour les servir, des poètes pour les chanter. Le seul problème était pour nous de savoir où et quand...” (4).

⁵¹ *PMG*² 64: Εὐνομίας <τε> καὶ Πειθῶς ἀδελφὰ/ καὶ Προμαθήας θυγάτηρ. Cf. *PMG*² 57 for Dew daughter of Zeus and Selene. On Alkman’s personifications, see Piatkowski 1960, though her ideas on the “cosmogonic” fragment 2390 have been demolished by Most (1987).

⁵² *Bakch.* 7.1-3: ὦ λιπαρὰ θύγατερ Χρόνου τε κ[αί]/ Νυκτός, σὲ πεντήκοντα μηνῶν ἀμέραν/ ἐκκαϊδεκάταν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃαι. See Bowra (1964, ch.5) on Pindar’s genealogies.

⁵³ *Herakl.*, tr. Kahn 1979 (q.v. *ad loc.*). Fr. 53 DK (Kahn LXXXIII): Πόλεμος πάντων μὲν πατήρ ἐστι, πάντων δὲ βασιλεύς. Fr. 94 DK (Kahn XLIV): Ἥλιος γὰρ οὐχ ὑπερβήσεται μέτρα· εἰ δὲ μή, Ἐρινύες μιν Δίκης ἐπίκουροι ἐξευρήσουσιν. Fr. 52 DK (Kahn XLIV): αἰὼν παῖς ἐστι παίζων, πεσσεύων· παιδὸς ἢ βασιλῆϊ. Cf. the personifications of Empedokles frs.116-7 Wright (1981, 280-2), related by pairing, mostly as oppositions, e.g. “lovely Truth and blind Uncertainty”.

⁵⁴ *Op.* 763-4: φήμη δ’ οὐ τις πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται, ἥντινα πολλοὶ/ λαοὶ φημίξωσι θεός νύ τις ἐστι καὶ αὐτή. See above n.27 on Aischines’ use of PHEME, and Parker (1996, 235) on “the easy transition from a description of PHEME’s power to an inference that she is divine”.

him not only as conventionally impious but also as something of a sophist.⁵⁵ A number of comparable statements appear in Euripides' tragedies, such as Helen's exclamation "Gods! For recognising one's friends is a god."⁵⁶ In the *Trojan Women*, Hekabe opens the *agon* scene with a prayer addressed to "Zeus, whether the compulsion of nature or the mind (*nous*) of men", and later equates Helen's particular *nous* with Aphrodite: "Seeing him (Paris) your own mind was made the Kyprian; Aphrodite is just the folly of mortals, and the goddess' name comes straight from her *aphrosyne*."⁵⁷ In the *Phoenician Women*, Iokasta exhorts Eteokles to shun the "unjust goddess" Ambition and rather "honour Equality".⁵⁸ Paradoxically, no one would suggest that this kind of statement is indicative of "real" deity; presumably it is the very fact that Ambition is *not* a goddess that gives the description its point.⁵⁹ A related problem is presented by hymnic invocations of personifications. Pindar's address to Hesychia, for example, has several formal features of the hymn genre: an initial address followed by reference to Hesychia's parentage, descriptive relative clauses and a statement of power introduced by γὰρ:

Kindly Quiet, daughter of Justice who makes cities very great, you who hold the sovereign keys of councils and of wars, receive from Aristomenes the honour of a Pythian victory. For you know how to give gentleness to others as well as receiving it, at exactly the right time.⁶⁰

Since Hesychia appears so deified only in Pindar, this cannot be taken as evidence for a cult as such, but we should be cautious of dismissing her claim to divine status out of

⁵⁵ *Cyc.* 316-7: ὁ πλοῦτος, ἀνθρωπίσκε, τοῖς σοφοῖς θεός,/ τὰ δ' ἄλλα κόμπαι καὶ λόγων εὐμορφίαι. Seaford 1984, 164 (*ad loc.*): "This form of statement had been used for the simple attribution of divinity or description of popular allegiance. The sophistic movement of the late-5th century may be behind a third use: sophisticated attribution of divinity, tending towards persuasive redefinition of divinity, particularly when it appears to be exclusive."

⁵⁶ *Eur. Helen* 560: ὦ θεοί· θεὸς γὰρ καὶ τὸ γινώσκειν φίλους.

⁵⁷ *Eur. Troiad.* 886-7: Ζεὺς, εἴτ' ἀνάγκη φύσεος εἴτε νοῦς βροτῶν,/ προσηυξάμην σε. *Ibid.* 988-90: ὁ σὸς δ' ἰδὼν νιν νοῦς ἐποιήθη Κύπρις;/ τὰ μῶρα γὰρ πάντ' ἐστὶν Ἀφροδίτη βροτοῖς,/ καὶ τοῦνομ' ὀρθῶς ἀφροσύνης ἄρχει θεᾶς. Cf. *Eur. fr.* 1018 Nauck: ὁ νοῦς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐστὶν ἐν ἐκάστῳ θεός.

⁵⁸ *Phoin.* 531-6: τί τῆς κακίστης δαιμόνων ἐφίεσαι/ Φιλοτιμίας, παῖ μὴ σύ γ'· ἄδικος ἢ θεός·... κεῖνο κάλλιον, τέκνον,/ Ἰσότητα τιμᾶν.

⁵⁹ But see below pp.192-3 on Wealth.

⁶⁰ *P.* 8.1-7: Φιλόφρον Ἥσυχία, Δίκας/ ὦ μεγιστόπολι θύγατερ,/ βουλᾶν τε καὶ πολέμων/ ἔχουσα κλαῖδας ὑπερτάτας/ Πυθιονικὸν τιμὰν Ἀριστομένει δέκευ./ τὸ γὰρ τὸ μαλθακὸν ἔρξαι τε καὶ παθεῖν ὁμῶς/ ἐπίστασαι καιρῷ σὺν ἀτρεκεῖ. Cf. *fr.* 109 SM, *O.* 4.16 and *N.* 9.48 for Pindar's Hesychia.

hand.⁶¹ The question of the status implied by hymns will arise later in the cases of Nemesis, Hygieia and Eirene.⁶² The seriousness or otherwise of an invocation's context is important in assessing the status of its addressee, and I would obviously not take such a comic passage as the opening of Lucian's poem on gout to indicate *podagra*'s godhead: "O hateful name, o you who are hated by the gods, Gout, much-groan-causing, child of the River of Wailing (Kokytos)..."⁶³

In addition to the personifications merely talked about in tragedy and comedy, a number appear as *dramatis personae*, presenting something of a challenge of representation for the producer, ancient and modern. In extant tragedy the phenomenon is limited to the *Prometheus Bound*'s Kratos and Bia (see below) and Lyssa, who probably first appeared in Aischylos' *Xantriai* but is better known to us from Euripides' *Madness of Herakles*.⁶⁴ A number of personifications, including Lyssa, however, appear in Pollux' list of characters requiring "special masks" (ἑκσκευα πρόσωπα), at the end of a section describing the masks of various stock tragic characters:

Special masks: Aktaion is horned, Phineus blind, Thamyras having one eye grey the other black, Argos many-eyed, Euippe being changed into a horse by Cheiron in Euripides, Cheiron, Tyro with livid cheeks in Sophokles — [this because she has suffered her step-mother Sidero's blows] — Achilles with hair shorn because of Patroklos, Amymone, a river, a mountain, Gorgo, Dike, Thanatos, Erinys, Lyssa, Oistros, Hybris, a Centaur, a Titan, a Giant, Indos, Triton, and briefly Polis, Priam, Peitho, Muses, Seasons, [Mithakos'] Nymphs, Pleiades, [Apate, Methe, Oknos, Phthonos].⁶⁵

⁶¹ For a full treatment of Pindar's use of hymnic invocations, see Williamson 1990, 219-47; she concludes that no clear line can be drawn between "the ritual and the literary" (240). See Pulleyn (1997, 43-51) on the relationship between hymns and prayers.

⁶² See below for hymns to Nemesis (p.122), Hygieia (p.158) and Eirene (pp.196-7).

⁶³ Luc. *Podagra* 1-2: ὦ στυγνὸν οὐνομ', ὦ θεοῖς στυγούμενον,/ Ποδάγρα, πολυστένακτε, Κωκυτοῦ τέκνον... Thanks to Nicky Devlin for many hymn references.

⁶⁴ Aisch. fr. 368 Mette. Eur. *HF* 843-74. On Lyssa, see Shapiro 1993, 168-70, and see Trendall (1989, fig. 355) for Mania watching Herakles on a Paestan kalyx-krater (Madrid 11094).

⁶⁵ Pollux 4.141-2: τὰ δ' ἑκσκευα πρόσωπα Ἀκταίων ἐστι κερασφόρος, ἡ Φινεὺς τυφλός, ἡ Θάμυρις τὸν μὲν ἔχων γλαυκὸν ὀφθαλμὸν τὸν δὲ μέλανα, ἡ Ἄργος πολυόφθαλμος, ἡ Εὐίππη ἡ Χείρωνος ὑπαλλαττομένη εἰς ἵππον παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ, ἡ Τυρὼ πελιδνὴ τὰς παρειὰς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ — [τοῦτο δ' ὑπὸ τῆς μητρυῖας Σιδηροῦς πληγαῖς πέπονθεν] — ἡ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ ἄκομος, ἡ Ἀμυμώνη, ἡ ποταμὸς ἡ ὄρος, ἡ Γοργώ, ἡ Δίκη ἡ Θάνατος ἡ Ἑρινὺς ἡ Λύσσα ἡ Οἶστρος ἡ Ὑβρις, ἡ Κένταυρος ἡ Τιτὰν ἡ Γίγας ἡ Ἰνδος ἡ Τρίτων, τάχα δὲ καὶ Πόλις καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ Πειθὼ καὶ Μοῦσαι καὶ Ὠραὶ καὶ [Μιθάκου] Νύμφαι καὶ Πλειάδες [καὶ Ἀπάτη καὶ Μέθη καὶ Ὀκνος καὶ Φθόνος.] Apate, Methe, Oknos and Phthonos appear in only one MS.

Apart from Lyssa, Oistros may have appeared in Euripides' *Antiope*, but what plays the others are from is a matter of speculation; nonetheless, the passage is a reminder of how much tragedy is lost to us, and that personifications may have appeared on the tragic stage more often than our few surviving examples would suggest.⁶⁶ Webster argues that Pollux' list may derive from Aristophanes of Byzantium's *On Masks* (Athen. 659e), and iconographic evidence relates many of his masks to the late fourth or early third century, giving some idea of what early Hellenistic revivals of classical tragedies might have looked like.⁶⁷ A great variety of personified characters likewise appears in extant comedy, Old and New. Aristophanes has Just and Unjust Arguments debating at length in the *Clouds*, while Demos is a principal character in the *Knights*, as is Wealth in the *Ploutos*, which also features Poverty, while the Eirene of the *Peace* is attended by Vintage and Festival.⁶⁸ In Menander's more everyday world, the personifications Ignorance, Fortune and Proof still find a place speaking the prologues of, respectively, the *Perikeiromene*, the *Aspis* and a play of unknown title.⁶⁹ Once again, such characters may be purely inventions of the playwright to suit the dramatic circumstances of the moment, but the fact that personifications were presented in physical form must have helped, alongside representations in the visual arts, to give them substance in the popular imagination.⁷⁰

Before leaving literary personification, the phenomenon of interpretational allegory deserves some notice, since the two are often confused. The exact converse of the deification of abstract ideas is the process whereby the name of a personal god comes to function as an appellative for what the god represents.⁷¹

⁶⁶ Oistros appears on a calyx-krater by the Underworld Painter in a scene of the punishment of Dirke, thought to be derived from the *Antiope*: Melbourne, Gedes coll. A 5.4; Trendall 1989, 91 fig. 211.

⁶⁷ Webster 1952b; he does not cover the "special masks" as such.

⁶⁸ On the *Peace*, see below pp.198-201. See Komornicka 1964 for an exhaustive treatment of Aristophanes' personifications. Cf. Taplin (1993, 101-4) on the suggestion that the two Arguments of the *Clouds* might have been costumed as cocks rather than humans.

⁶⁹ *Perik.* 121-71, *Aspis* 97-148, fr. 717 Körte. Cf. Lucian *Pseudol.* 4 on Elenchos. Webster (1949, 7) seems to have little evidence for the suggestion that Methe spoke the prologue to a Menandrian comedy. See Holzberg (1974, 62-3 n.223) for the suggestion that Eleos spoke the prologue to the *Epitrepontes*; on the question in general, Hunter 1985, 60 ff. Picard (1942) discusses the influence of the theatre on the development of allegory.

⁷⁰ Picard (1942) argues that dramatic personifications even provided inspiration for their representation in the visual arts.

⁷¹ Burkert (1987, 78): "One ought to keep distinct, however, the two directions of allegorical elaboration".

We should note that all the Greeks, when they saw a thing to be powerful, believed that its power did not operate without the authority of the gods. They called both the powerful thing and the god set over it by the one name.⁷²

This passage from Tzetzes' commentary on Hesiod continues with an extensive list of "things", both tangible and abstract, which are called by god's names: Hephaistos for fire, Demeter for bread, Bakchos for wine, Athena for wisdom, Aphrodite for sex.⁷³ This would seem to go hand in hand with the philosophical trend for allegorising the Olympian gods which is apparent from the mid fifth century on. Veyne discusses this as a strategy adopted by rationalists for upholding the truth of myth: "Since the Stoics are certain beforehand that myth and poetry speak the truth, they have only to put them to torture to reconcile them with this truth. Allegory will furnish this Procrustean bed."⁷⁴ It is not unreasonable to suppose that, by blurring the distinction between deity and abstract, the development of such interpretational allegory would have facilitated the making of personifications into gods. It cannot be coincidence that Prodikos, credited as one of the earliest exponents of the view that the gods are just names for elements of the world basic to human life, is also the author of the "Choice of Herakles", which Whitman calls "the first true personification allegory in the West".⁷⁵

⁷² Schol. Hes. *Op.* p.1 ll.279-82: Ἰστέον, ὅτι πάντα οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἃ δύναμιν ἔχοντα ἐώρων, οὐκ ἄνευ ἐπιστασίας θεῶν τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν ἐνεργεῖν ἐνόμιζον. ἐνὶ δὲ ὀνόματι τό τε τὴν δύναμιν ἔχον καὶ τὸν ἐπιστατοῦντα τούτῳ θεὸν ὠνόμαζον.

⁷³ Cicero (*De Natura Deorum* 2.23.60) illustrates this by quoting a line of Terence: *sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus* (cf. 3.24.62 for refutation).

⁷⁴ Veyne 1988, 65. On Homeric gods as "personifications of psychological motivations, or externalised causes for unexpected events" see Burton 1996, ch. 1.2.

⁷⁵ Prodikos fr. 5 DK. Whitman 1987 makes a clear distinction between compositional and interpretative allegory in his stimulating account of allegory in ancient and medieval literature; cf. Lewis 1936, 44-111, and Curtius 1948, 128-44, 203-13. Particular questions of allegorical interpretation will be raised throughout this thesis, but for general studies of allegory in ancient art, see Hinks 1939 and Shapiro 1986.

The Visual Arts

... the ancients, wishing to make Fortune's wickedness manifest, were not satisfied with painting and sculpting her merely in the form of a woman (though this is sufficient sign of folly) but also gave her a rudder to have in her hand, placed under her feet a rolling pedestal and deprived her of her eyes; demonstrating through all these things the uncertainty of fortune.⁷⁶

Personification in the visual arts presents a different set of problems. Unlike the literary figure, there is no room for ambiguity between abstract and personification: the artist either represents an abstract in human incarnation, or the idea must be expressed without recourse to anthropomorphism at all, so degrees of "personifiedness" are not in question.⁷⁷ Rather, the major problem with visual representations is that of identification: how are we to recognise a personified abstraction in sculpture or painting? The figures familiar to us from the Classical Tradition are identifiable by their armoury of attributes or particular style of (un)dress, a language which requires a dictionary such as Cesare Ripa's influential *Iconologia* of 1593 for its interpretation.⁷⁸ Some of these attributes have a long tradition, but very few are acquired before the Hellenistic period, and may not be constant even then. What is immediately striking about the figures of the period 600-400 BC catalogued in Shapiro's *Personifications in Greek Art* is their similarity — the vast majority are in the form of young women with no distinguishing features, only identifiable if accompanied by an inscription. Of the figures to be considered below, only Hygieia is readily recognisable by her snake, Eirene less easily so by the cornucopia-carrying child she holds (although this could equally make her Tyche), and the two Nemeseis of Smyrna by their measuring-rods; for identification of Themis, Peitho and the fifth-century Nemesis we are entirely reliant on inscriptions.⁷⁹ In the following chapters I shall consider one or two more speculative cases, where identification rests on

⁷⁶ Galen *Exhortation to Medicine* 2.2, tr. Rebecca Flemming: ἥς τὴν μοχθηρίαν ἐμφανίσαι βουλευθέντες οἱ παλαιοὶ γράφοντες καὶ πλάττοντες αὐτὴν οὐ μόνον ἐν εἴδει γυναικὸς ἠρκέσθησαν, καίτοι τοῦθ' ἱκανὸν ἦν ἀνοίας σύμβολον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πηδάλιον ἔδοσαν ἐν χεροῖν ἔχειν αὐτῇ καὶ τοῖν ποδοῖν ὑπέθεσαν βάσιν σφαιρικήν, ἐστέρησαν δὲ καὶ τοῖν ὀφθαλμοῖν ἐνδεικνύμενοι διὰ τούτων ἀπάντων τὸ τῆς Τύχης ἄστατον.

⁷⁷ Cf. Beazley (1947, 7) on Athanasia. Shapiro (1993, 15) proposes some distinction of degree in terms of more or less specific iconographies.

⁷⁸ The second edition (1603) advertises itself as "ampliata di 400 & più imagini". Each figure is described, many with accompanying illustration, and an explanation given of her/his attributes, often backed up by quotations from Latin texts.

⁷⁹ See below on Hygieia (pp.174-81) and Peace (pp.190-4).

context/analogy, but an element of doubt must usually remain where inscriptions are lacking.⁸⁰

A further technical consideration is raised if we ask what purpose artistic personifications serve. In some cases a figure may already be familiar as part of the story known to us from literary sources, so any allegorical significance is already built into the narrative context, as in the case of Sleep and Death carrying Sarpedon off the battlefield.⁸¹ In others personifications may have an explanatory function, giving expression to ideas not easily portrayed in visual form. In a period when landscape is almost totally subservient to the human form, personified localities or rivers may serve to indicate a geographical setting, as with the rivers Alpheios and Kladeos on the east pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, or the figure of Delos on vases depicting the birth of Apollo and Artemis.⁸² Similarly, personified abstractions may provide a “psychological context”, or draw attention to particular aspects of the scene/myth, as on the Heimarmene Painter’s “Persuasion of Helen” vase.⁸³ Less specifically, personified figures can provide a general atmosphere, as with the Meidias Painter’s “feel-good” vases,⁸⁴ nor should comic intent be ruled out: the humour of Lucian’s *Gout* is paralleled by the Kraipale Painter’s personification of Hangover.⁸⁵

Although visual representations are unequivocally personified, then, their status on the “artistic device—cult figure” scale is no more definitionally secure than that of their literary counterparts. When it comes to their use as evidence for a figure’s cult, different visual media present a variety of methodological problems, of which a brief review is in order.

⁸⁰ On the need for accompanying texts to make more complex symbolism intelligible, cf. Cohen 1997, 97-101.

⁸¹ See below pp.51-2.

⁸² E.g. Ferrara Mus. Arch. 20298 (ARV² 1277, 22) ; Vienna Kunsthist. Mus. IV 1771 (ARV² 1318); Palermo Mus. Naz. (ARV² 1321, 9). Cf. Aellen (1994, 133) on the function of “macrocosmic” personifications on South Italian vases.

⁸³ See below pp.107-8 and 150-1. Aellen argues that personifications have a particular role in relation to the funerary function of the ceramics he is discussing, making the myths represented more universal, and in some cases offering hope for justice in the afterlife (1994, 65-6, 180-93).

⁸⁴ See below pp.174-6.

⁸⁵ Not noted by Shapiro 1993. Attic red-figure oinochoe, c.430 BC, Boston 00.352, ARV² 1214,1; see Caskey and Beazley 1954, II no.112.

First, free-standing sculpture. In the absence of the kind of narrative context available to help identification in vase-painting or relief sculpture, it is hardly surprising that many possible identifications of personifications in free-standing sculpture remain speculative.⁸⁶ Even where identity can be established, however, whether the existence of a statue of a personification is indicative of her cult is a moot point, since the vagaries of survival and the problem of Roman copies mean that adequate information about a work's original context is often not available.⁸⁷ Even in the rare case of an original statue found more or less *in situ*, such as Agorakritos' Nemesis at Rhamnous, cross-referencing with literary sources is necessary to allow definite identification as the cult image.⁸⁸ More often literary sources may allow us to identify the subject of a statue and its sculptor, as in the case of Kephisodotos' Eirene, but put us no further forward in determining the figure's status — if a statue is not specifically the cult image from a shrine, was it necessarily regarded as embodying the divine? The relationship between the gods and their representations was a matter of discussion even in antiquity; common sense would suggest that different viewers would have had differing opinions on the subject, but even a single person's response to a particular statue is likely to be beyond the reach of modern scholarship to reconstruct.⁸⁹ Perhaps more clear-cut, however, are cases where we have a statue base with a dedicatory inscription, with or without the actual statue; not only does such an inscription usually establish the statue's identity but it also implies the divinity of the figure represented, since the statue is meant as an offering.⁹⁰

⁸⁶ See e.g. Harrison (1977), who makes an interesting, if not entirely convincing, case for identifying the seated goddess L from the east pediment of the Parthenon as Themis. She suggests that Themis would also be a suitable identity for the much debated colossal statue found in front of the Royal Stoa in the Agora (Agora S 2370, c.330 BC): "No other goddess would be so appropriate to stand in front of the place where the law-court of the Archon Basileus held session and where the ancestral law-codes of the Athenians were inscribed on stone" (157). *Contra*, see Palagia 1994, who identifies this as Agathe Tyche, against her own earlier identification of it (1982) as Demokratia.

⁸⁷ See Ridgway 1984.

⁸⁸ See below pp.101-4.

⁸⁹ Compare e.g. Plut. *Mor.* 379c-d (on the popular elision of god and representation) with Pollitt's selection of passages on "Late Hellenistic idealism" (1990, 223-4, cf. 5-6). The question is raised in the, perhaps unexpected, medium of vase-painting on an early Apulian column-krater, where a sculptor at work on a statue of Herakles is watched by none other than the hero himself (Trendall 1989, fig.131). The problem of "viewing and religious experience" is discussed at length by Tanner 1995, 44-80. Cf. Cohen (1997, 14-16) on the impossibility of viewing "through Greek eyes".

⁹⁰ See below e.g. on Chairestratos' Themis (pp. 79-80), and Pyrrhos' Athena Hygieia (p.164).

Architectural sculpture suffers from the same problems of identification as the free-standing variety, and only rarely has any attempt been made to recognise a personification other than Nike or Erôs on a frieze or pediment; the decorative nature of such sculpture makes it unreliable as evidence for cult status.⁹¹ Other relief sculpture has some advantages because of its tendency to be associated with an inscription. A fair number of local personifications have, for example, been identified on fourth-century Attic document reliefs from the content of the inscription they accompany, as discussed by Amy Smith.⁹² She sees the images as ephemeral devices making the substance of the document intelligible to the illiterate, or merely lazy, viewer, rather than necessarily an indication of cult status.⁹³ This does not of course preclude a figure depicted on a document relief from having divinity, but cult status would have to be demonstrated from external sources. The Demokratia shown crowning Demos on the well known anti-tyranny decree relief of 337/6 BC from the Athenian Agora is a good example — she is known from other epigraphic sources to have been in receipt of cult at this period, but the relief adds to our information by providing us with our earliest extant image of the goddess.⁹⁴ Votive reliefs, however, are a different matter, since they are by definition from a cult context. The conventional differentiation in size between humans and deities is useful in interpreting the scene represented, although the identity of the divine figures may have to be inferred from any accompanying inscription, or from the relief's provenance (if known). Where there is no inscription preserved identification may be difficult to establish with certainty, but iconographic context may be of assistance, as in the various reliefs depicting a female figure of divine scale in company with Aklepios, for whom Hygieia is at least a probable identification.⁹⁵

A large proportion of our material evidence for personifications in the fifth century is provided by Attic painted pottery. Only in very rare cases can the appearance of a personification in this medium be taken as anything like positive

⁹¹ See above n.86 on Themis, below pp.146-7 on Peitho.

⁹² Smith 1997, 172-87. On the document reliefs in general, see Lawton 1995.

⁹³ Smith 1997, 173; she points out that Hamdorf frequently, and misleadingly, cites such reliefs as testimonia.

⁹⁴ Athens, Agora I 6524, *SEG* XII.87; Stewart 1997, 154 fig.93. On Demokratia's iconography, see Alexandri-Tzahou 1986, 1993 and 1994; on her cult at Athens, see below p.189 and n.30.

⁹⁵ Below pp.177-8.

attestation of cult — Themis welcoming Bendis on a red-figure skyphos in Tübingen may be an example⁹⁶ — although the inclusion of a personification may sometimes be most readily explained on the hypothesis of the artist/commissioner's knowledge of a local cult.⁹⁷ More often vase-painting, like literature, needs to be taken as supplementary to more direct evidence, adding to the general impression of how well known a particular personification may have been. At the most it may be permissible to argue on the basis of a figure's repeated appearance in vase-painting for an earlier date for her cult than more explicit testimonies allow — parallel with the methodology adopted by Oakley and Sinos in their study of the Athenian wedding.⁹⁸ The vase shape may give some indication of how a particular figure was viewed — e.g. Himeros and Pothos are deemed appropriate decorations for pyxides, containers for cosmetics — although this is more helpful for establishing conceptual categories than status. The broader question of the status of the painted pottery itself is relevant to some extent, insofar as it has implications for the status of the creators and users of the images, but the matter of function is perhaps more immediately germane: were the pieces I shall be considering made for everyday use or specifically to accompany their owners to the afterlife?⁹⁹ If the latter, we might look for some funerary significance in their decoration, as Aellen has done in his study of personifications on South Italian ceramics.¹⁰⁰ Even more of a concern, with Attic pottery, is the question of whether the images can be seen as a fair reflection of concerns close to home, or were influenced by the demands of an export market. Such problems are not susceptible of resolution in the space available here, but the question-marks they throw over the use of painted pottery as evidence will be borne in mind when considering individual pieces below.¹⁰¹ As I have not been looking at any instances of personification cults in the Greek

⁹⁶ Below p.78.

⁹⁷ See below on Nemesis (p.98) and Hygieia (p.175).

⁹⁸ Oakley and Sinos 1993, 7. Cf. Sutton 1992 on the use of vase-painting as evidence for women's lives, and Hamilton 1992 on iconographic evidence for the ritual of the Athenian Anthesteria (see especially pp.123-46 for wider application of his methodology).

⁹⁹ Vickers and Gill 1990; see Gill 1988 for a brief outline of problems involved in reconstructing the Greek vase trade and the view that pottery was only secondary to more important cargoes.

¹⁰⁰ Aellen 1994.

¹⁰¹ Useful surveys of questions surrounding the production and trade of painted pottery are provided in Rasmussen and Spivey (eds.) 1991 by A. Johnston, on the market (203-32) and N. Spivey, on Etruscan customers (131-51). See Seeberg 1994 for fifth-century Athenian customers dealing directly with the painter.

colonies of Southern Italy, I have generally not made reference to South Italian vase-painting, except where a connection could be argued via the influence of drama.¹⁰² One point noted by Aellen, however, provides an interesting parallel for a feature observable in Attic vase-painting: the great majority of South Italian personifications are found on Apulian vases, and especially in the work of the Darius Painter and his immediate predecessors and successors. In Attic vase-painting there is likewise a concentration of personifications to be seen in the work of the Meidias Painter and his school.¹⁰³ It is at least a possibility that our impression of the prevalence of personifications on painted pottery has been exaggerated by the popularity of such figures in two particular workshops.

OTHER MATERIAL EVIDENCE AND PROSE WRITERS

Personifications in poetic literature and the visual arts, then, present considerable problems of identification and are not necessarily indicative of a figure's actual worship; for more direct attestation of cult we need to turn to other forms of material evidence and to various genres of prose literature written in the Roman period.

The exact sites where most of the figures to be considered below were worshipped are unfortunately unknown — we either have only very imprecise information on their location or there is nothing on the ground to confirm the kind of notice given by our written sources. The sanctuary of Nemesis and Themis at Rhamnous is exceptional, being the only sanctuary yet found dedicated primarily to a personification; usually it is rather the case that a personification has some subsidiary representation in the sanctuary of an Olympian — as Hygieia has statues, and occasionally altars, in Asklepieia. Where written sources do associate a personification cult with a reasonably specific location it is obviously worth looking for archaeological traces, although matching up the two is rarely straightforward — the case of Eleos, as we shall see, is a particularly good illustration of the problems involved. The main problem with archaeological evidence is, once again, one of identification, since we are nearly always going to need some form of written information to connect any site with

¹⁰² In general see Taplin 1993, or, for a briefer account, A.D. Trendall in Rasmussen and Spivey 1991 (151-82).

¹⁰³ Aellen 1994, 15; see below pp.174-6.

a personification — either a description from a prose writer or an inscription from the site itself naming the deity in question. This is of course more broadly true, but in the case of better known deities we are more likely to have comparative evidence to aid identification. Particular sorts of offering, sometimes special sacrificial animals, are associated with some gods — representations of body-parts for Asklepios, doves for Aphrodite, pigs for Demeter — so that a shrine may be identified by the votives dedicated there.¹⁰⁴ We have as yet established no such information about any deified abstraction, however, so that personification cults must easily go unrecognised in the archaeological record.

The one type of material evidence which can supply us with relatively firm identification of a personification's cult is epigraphy. The largest category with which I shall be concerned is made up of inscriptions recording dedications and a number which name cult personnel, but there are also a few instances of financial accounts relating to a personification's cult — loans made from "Nemesis' silver" at Rhamnous, profits from the sale of skins from Eirene's sacrificial victims — one case of regulations concerning the prohibition of particular sacrificial victims (for Peitho), and one of the inscription of a hymn (to Hygieia).¹⁰⁵ Inscriptions arguably share some of the advantages of other material evidence and prose sources: an inscription is (almost) always attached to a specific location and is often at least approximately datable;¹⁰⁶ it "speaks" more directly than most material remains, and the genre is generally less prone to the problems of artistic licence encountered elsewhere.¹⁰⁷ Inscriptions of course suffer from the same problems of preservation as other kinds of material evidence, and not all have readily comprehensible texts, but the most common difficulty encountered by the non-specialist is inadequate documentation: details of find-spots are not always recorded, nor dating criteria, which is particularly frustrating

¹⁰⁴ Many of the articles collected in Alcock and Osborne (eds.) 1994 discuss such problems of identification. See e.g. C. Morgan on the dedicant of the first temple at Corinth (138-9), S.G. Cole on dedications to Demeter — "These are so regular in type that many minor sanctuaries of Demeter may be identified by the votives alone" (203) — and M. Jost on "landscape preferences among the gods" (219-21). Cf. the more theoretical papers of F. de Polignac on the "visibility" of Geometric cults (3-18), and R. Osborne on archaeology and the history of cult activity in archaic Attika (143-60).

¹⁰⁵ Below pp.100, 127, 158 and 189.

¹⁰⁶ By an explicit dating-formula, the find-context, or letter-forms, though the latter may provide quite a wide range; on inscriptions and absolute dating, see e.g. Biers 1992, 65-7.

¹⁰⁷ Though e.g. see pp.135-6 below on Peitho at Daphne.

where the inscription has been lost since recording; nor is it always made clear just how speculative restorations of missing passages are. The absence of such information, especially contextual details, may obviously limit the usefulness of such documents as evidence for cult practice.¹⁰⁸

This brings us finally to the writers of various genres of prose in the Roman period who are major sources of information about cults of all sorts, and often provide our only evidence for the worship of a particular personification. Shrines, statues and altars dedicated to personifications are among the myriad religious sights commented upon by Pausanias in his travels around mainland Greece, some of them merely listed, others more extensively discussed. Traditionally taken as a fairly straightforward chronicle of Greek monuments and customs, Pausanias' text and its usefulness as evidence for ancient cult practice has been the subject of much recent scrutiny of late. Habicht and (more recently) Arafat look especially at the criteria Pausanias applies to the choice of monuments he describes, his constant emphasis on autopsy, and what kind of information he is more or less reliable on.¹⁰⁹ Elsner provocatively defines Pausanias as a "pilgrim", self-consciously exploring Greek identity through an examination of his own land rather than by an implicit definition by contrast with the otherness of Egypt or Scythia.¹¹⁰ The historical context in which Pausanias was travelling has always to be remembered, and the inherent conflict between his project to give an account of the distinguished past of a free Greece and the politics of his own day, when Greece could be regarded as a unity largely because of its status as the Roman province of Achaia. However, Pausanias' almost obsessive interest in religious sites and ceremonies, and the importance he attached to the experience of "seeing for oneself", make him considerably better informed than many of our sources, and I shall

¹⁰⁸ For an excellent example of how an inscription *can* be presented, with full contextual information, see Jameson, Jordan and Kotansky 1993. The articles collected in Hägg (ed.) 1994 demonstrate a number of approaches to the issue of using epigraphic evidence for cult practice.

¹⁰⁹ Habicht 1985 and Arafat 1996 (see especially chs.1-2). Cf. D. Birge on "Trees in Pausanias' landscape", in Alcock and Osborne 1994, 231-45.

¹¹⁰ Elsner 1992. The comparison of Pausanias to the early Christian pilgrim such as Egeria may not tell the whole story — Elsner himself draws attention to the important differences that Pausanias was travelling in his own country rather than journeying to distant holy lands, and was writing for an audience who did not necessarily share the particulars of his religious experience, which could encompass the variety of a "mass of conflicting myth-histories" (28).

be referring to him more than to any other ancient author.¹¹¹ I would place more weight on his testimony for things he has actually seen than the stories he adduces to explain them, and will be bearing in mind the possibility of discontinuities in cult practice over the centuries which separate his description from the past he favours.¹¹²

Slightly earlier than Pausanias, though still very much a product of the Roman Empire, is Plutarch, whose moralising biographies and essays are my source in a number of cases below. Despite his philosophical interests, he seems to have retained great respect for traditional cult practices, as is apparent from his writings as well as his position as priest at Delphi. His desire to hold intellectual and more conservatively religious views in balance can be seen in a passage, of particular relevance to the current enquiry, in the *Erotikos*, where Erôs' divinity is under discussion. The young Plutarch of the dialogue warns against allowing clever allegorical interpretations to undermine traditional faith in the gods:

Others again will say that Aphrodite is desire, Hermes, speech, the Muses arts, and Athena wisdom. You can see the abyss of atheism that opens under our feet if we classify the gods as various passions, capacities, or virtues.¹¹³

It would appear that the ultimate sanction for taking Erôs seriously as a god rather than a more abstract force is simply that “the ancient faith of our fathers suffices” (§13).¹¹⁴ As with Pausanias, the fact that Plutarch is writing in a Greece much changed from its classical heyday must always be taken into account; it can often be unclear whether he is referring to ancient practices or ones influenced by the current Roman rule, although he does sometimes demonstrate awareness that even the most traditional of rituals can change over time.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ Arafat 1996, 17: “Autopsy is, in my view, the single most distinctive feature in Pausanias' work”.

¹¹² Cf. Alcock on “Minding the gap in Hellenistic and Roman Greece” (Alcock and Osborne, eds. 1994, 247-61), and Arafat 1995 on the changing functions of the temple of Hera at Olympia.

¹¹³ *Eroticus* §14 (757b-c): ἕτεροι δ' αὖ φήσουσι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐπιθυμίαν εἶναι καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν λόγον καὶ τέχνας τὰς Μούσας καὶ φρόνησιν τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν. ὁρᾶς δήπου τὸν ὑπολαμβάνοντα βυθὸν ἡμᾶς ἀθεότητος, ἂν εἰς πάθη καὶ δυνάμεις καὶ ἀρετὰς διαγράφωμεν ἕκαστον τῶν θεῶν. On the speech, see Russell 1997.

¹¹⁴ Cf. *Eroticus* §18 (763b-d), on the relative merits of poets, lawgivers and philosophers as guides for belief in the gods. On Plutarch's ambivalent attitude towards allegory, see Stafford 1999a. Cf. Sokrates' caution about rationalising explanations of the myth of Boreas and Oreithyia (Plato, *Phaed.* 229-30).

¹¹⁵ See e.g. the essay entitled *Why are oracles no longer delivered in hexameter verse?* (*Mor.* 394-409). On Plutarch's position as a Greek aristocrat in the Roman Empire, see Boulogne 1994, and Mossman (ed.) 1997; and see below p.153 on a *Roman Question*.

The Elder Pliny provides some information on representations of personifications in sculpture, and their creators; Pollitt points to the “traditional and unoriginal nature” of Pliny’s chapters on art in support of their worth as evidence, drawing, as Pliny himself claims they do, on as many as 2,000 earlier sources.¹¹⁶ Athenaios is even more given to citing his sources, perhaps as a display of erudition, which facilitates the analysis of the earlier material he quotes so freely; although the starting point for any discussion in the *Deipnosophistai* is of course always an item of food or drink, the range of material drawn in is extremely wide, and includes several passages of relevance to personification cults.¹¹⁷ Finally, a mine of fascinating titbits about otherwise obscure personifications, their festivals and other rituals is to be found in the works of scholiasts commenting on ancient texts, and of lexicographers who range in date from the second to the ninth centuries AD — Zenobios, Hesychios, Pollux, Photios, the *Suda*. Clearly these need to be treated with the greatest caution, since they are writing a long time after many of the customs they describe must have fallen into disuse, and we usually do not know what sources they are drawing on, but they can sometimes shed at least plausible light on problems raised by other sources.

WORKING CRITERIA

To sum up, then. Personifications in literature and art may be more or less well developed, but without external evidence there is always the possibility that they are no more than the products of poetic licence.¹¹⁸ Epigraphy affords the most unequivocal information available for actual cult status, usually in the form of dedications naming a personification as recipient, and later writers of various prose genres provide much of my material: Plutarch, sundry lexicographers, and above all Pausanias. However reliable or otherwise their testimony, they are at least setting out to be informative, and I take their reference to an altar, a temple or sacrifices belonging to a personification as at least a reasonable basis for investigation. The perennial problem of the lateness of

¹¹⁶ Pollitt 1990, 2-4; Pliny *NH praef.*17; most of the sources Pliny actually names were Greek, and some were even practising artists. For a thorough evaluation of Pliny’s chapters on art, see Isager 1991.

¹¹⁷ Arafat 1997 contrasts Athenaios’ specificity with Pausanias’ vague references to his wide reading.

¹¹⁸ See below for the theory that personifications begin life in literature/art, then somehow move into the sphere of cult.

such sources in relation to the institutions they describe can only be approached by juxtaposing them to the less explicit evidence afforded by earlier literature, art and archaeological remains. To a certain extent any conclusions have to remain provisional, since excavation continues at such important sites as Rhamnous and the Athenian Agora, inscriptions continue to be published, and more sophisticated analyses of the iconographic evidence continue to be produced.¹¹⁹ I hope, however, to have established at least a basic framework for further work with the evidence already available, and to have contributed in some small way towards the current trend for a more interdisciplinary approach to Greek religion.

III. *THE GENDER QUESTION*¹²⁰

(Adelmo compares images of the whore of Babylon and the Virgin Mary):
I was not so much struck by her form as by the thought that she, too, was a woman like the other, and yet this one was the vessel of every vice, whereas the other was the receptacle of every virtue. But the forms were womanly in both cases...¹²¹

If we take the personifications seriously, we must take their predominant femaleness seriously too.¹²²

The most immediately striking generalisation that can be made about personified figures is that the majority are female, a rule especially true of concepts connected with happiness and prosperity, "good things". Given the subordinate status of real women in ancient Greek society, it seems ironic that the qualities deemed desirable by Greek men should be represented in female form.¹²³ Peace is a mother

¹¹⁹ See e.g. below p.113 on the "Great Nemesis" inscription from Rhamnous, published as recently as 1992. Compare Shapiro 1993 e.g. with Smith 1997 on political personifications, and see forthcoming work by Barbara Borg (Heidelberg).

¹²⁰ This section now appears as an article in Foxhall and Salmon 1998 (Stafford 1998). Versions were given as papers in the *Gender Studies* seminar at Oxford (28/11/94) and the *Masculinity, Power and Identity* seminar at Nottingham (3/12/94); both audiences made helpful suggestions and I am particularly grateful to Richard Hawley for his subsequent comments and references.

¹²¹ Umberto Eco, *The Name of the Rose*, London 1994, 241.

¹²² Padel 1992, 160; cf. 158-9: "Personification, as the fifth century inherited and used it, was not an isolatable trick of language, but part of explaining what happened to and inside people... Cult, above all, tells us that the personifying mode answers to lived fifth-century reality."

¹²³ Blundell (1995, 17) comments on the paradox. Stewart discusses the problem in the broader context of Greek use of the naked male body as a metaphor for society: "the metaphor's very specificity and power immediately raised a problem. For *polis* in Greek is

and general terms for prosperity are firmly feminine, like Eutychia and Eudaimonia, not to mention Hygieia, the good Health needed to complement such fiscal well-being. Then there are the civic virtues of Democracy, Justice (Demokratia and Dike), and “Good Order”, in the form of Themis or Eunomia. Andreia does not appear until the 30s BC, depicted on the monument from Aphrodisias which commemorates Zoilos, but it is particularly striking that even “Manliness” should be feminine.¹²⁴ The standard answer usually advanced to explain this paradox is linguistic: in Indo-European languages the abstract nouns that tend to be personified are usually feminine in gender. But this is only a start, for why should such nouns be feminine in the first place? And what about those personified nouns which happen to be masculine or neuter in grammatical gender? Further investigation is needed into the sociological and iconographic context in which these personified abstracts developed.

Even English, despite its lack of an explicit grammatical gender system, has a certain under-cover engenderedness.¹²⁵ The only inanimate objects regularly given female gender, usually by their male owners, are boats, cars, and even church bells, but male-biased sexism can be found at many levels.¹²⁶ An example with obvious application to the case of personified abstractions is the fact that only girls are given as names nouns which designate virtues: the characters Mercy and Charity in Dickens’ *Martin Chuzzlewit* may sound a little old-fashioned, but Prudence and Constance were still popular in my grandmother’s generation, and in my own Verity, Felicity and Grace are not uncommon. Modern Greek girls’ names likewise include virtues, like Eirene, Elpis, Euphrosyne, Eleutheria, Nike and even Themis (Peace, Hope, Good Sense,

gendered feminine, as are most abstract nouns. Yet the city’s essence was above all, its *men*” (1997, 133).

¹²⁴ Zoilos, a freedman of Augustus, himself stands next to Time, “Honour”, while other personifications on the frieze include Mneme, along with the less abstract Polis and Roma: Erim 1979, pls. 21-9. Smith 1998 includes a photograph and drawing of the recent restoration of the frieze, which he calls “one of our best examples of Hellenistic civic allegory” (29).

¹²⁵ The inherent androcentrism of English is discussed at length by Spender 1990 and Key 1975.

¹²⁶ That bells should be “she” is particularly striking, given such proper names as “Great Tom” and “Big Ben” (thanks to Lin Foxhall and Hamish Forbes for a bell-ringing lesson). The inherent androcentrism of English is discussed at length by Spender 1990 and Key 1975. E.g. the idea that the male is the universal category, the norm from which others deviate, a theory which first found formal expression in John Kirkby’s *Eighty Eight Grammatical Rules* of 1746: rule no.21 states that the male gender is “more comprehensive” than the female (Spender 1990, 147-9).

Freedom, Victory, Order).¹²⁷ In ancient Greece real women are less often given abstract values as such than compounds, like Eurykleia,¹²⁸ where we do find a wide range of abstracts is in the context of prostitutes' *adopted* names. In some cases these seem appropriate to their calling, e.g. Peitho or Euphrosyne (Persuasion, Joy), but paradoxically the majority signify virtues worthy of any good citizen wife or daughter: Eukleia, Galene, Eirene, Sige (Fair Fame, Calm, Peace, Silence).¹²⁹

The gender of English personifications is neatly explained in an eighteenth century dialogue by Joseph Addison:

It is a great compliment methinks to the sex, says Cynthio, that your Virtues are generally shown in petticoats. I can give no other reason for it, says Philander, but because they chanced to be of feminine gender in the learned languages.¹³⁰

When faced with the question "Why are personifications predominantly female?" most commentators have been happy to point to the congruence between the female sex of these figures and the feminine gender of the abstract nouns they embody: the phenomenon is an accident of grammatical gender. Why such abstracts should be feminine in the first place, though, has generally been left to students of linguistics, as part of the inconclusive debate on the origins of grammatical gender.¹³¹

The terms masculine, feminine and neuter were first imposed by ancient grammarians, according to the majority of biologically male or female creatures in each morphological category.¹³² Aristotle cites Protagoras as his authority for distinguishing genders of nouns (γέννη ὀνομάτων) as masculine (ἄρρενα), feminine

¹²⁷ Thanks to the Greek students in my *Greek Religion* seminar group at Royal Holloway (1994/5) for compiling a list, which also includes: Ἀγάπη, Ἀθανασία, Ἀρετή, Εὐδοκία, Εὐδοξία, Εὐθυμία, Εὐμορφία, Εὐτυχία, Ζωή, Παρθενία, Πίστις, Σοφία.

¹²⁸ E.g. *LGPN* I lists just one Themis. Vol. II lists one Peitho and two Themides (though one of these can be read as a priestess of Themis, see below p.87).

¹²⁹ Athen. 13.577a, 583e, 587f, 593b, 4.157a. Eirene/a is particularly popular: 47 occurrences are listed in *LGPN* I, 36 in vol.II. A "mythical" poetess Φαντασία, wife of Memphes, daughter of Nikarchos is mentioned by Eustathios (*Comm. in Od.* 1379.62) and Photios (*Bibl.* 3.151ab). For geographical names, cf. Themistokles' daughters Sybaris, Italia, Asia and possibly Hellas: Whitby (forthcoming).

¹³⁰ *Dialogue upon the Usefulness of Ancient Medals*, London 1726, 36.

¹³¹ On linguistic gender and personification, see Wilamowitz (1931, 26): "Man könnte sagen, die Sprache selbst hätte mit der Personifikation angefangen, als sie den Abstrakta männliches und weibliches Geschlecht gab". For surveys of nineteenth- and twentieth-century theories on grammatical gender, see Fodor 1959, 7-30, and Ibrahim 1973, 14-50. More recently, Lazzeroni (1993) has espoused the position that gender is an arbitrary categorisation in Indo-European languages, but his article gives only a brief sketch of the arguments.

¹³² Cf. Foxhall on the attribution of sex and gender to plants in ancient Greece, in Foxhall and Salmon (eds.) 1998, 57-68.

(θήλεα), and inanimate objects (σκεύη). Aristotle uses the same terms, but sometimes substitutes μεταξύ for σκεύη, and notes that many inanimate objects are in fact designated by masculine or feminine nouns.¹³³ In the first century BC Dionysios of Thrace's *Art of Grammar* standardised the term οὐδέτερον for “neuter”, and added two further genders: “the common and the epicene: the common, e.g. horse or dog (*i.e. may be masc. or fem.*) and the epicene, e.g. swallow (*fem.*) or eagle (*masc.; i.e. always of same gender, whatever the sex referred to*).”¹³⁴ The problem of mismatches between grammatical gender and sex comes under discussion as early as Aristophanes. In the *Clouds* Sokrates is parodied as debating this along with other obscure topics in his “thinking-shop”. When Strepsiades begs to be taught the “unjust logic”, Sokrates replies that first he must learn some basics, and proceeds to set him linguistic traps to fall into. First the fact that ἀλεκτρυών can mean either “cock” or “hen” is regretted, and a new word ἀλεκτρύαινα is coined to distinguish the female. Much play is made with the gender of ἡ κάρδοπος (“kneading-trough”), one of those awkward feminine nouns of the second declension, which looks as though it ought to be masculine. Then a problem arises with some men's names which, being first declension nouns, look distinctly feminine in the vocative, e.g. Ἀμυνίας, Ἀμυνία.¹³⁵

Despite such difficulties, the theory of “natural gender”, i.e. that grammatical gender reflects biological sex, was espoused in the nineteenth century by such scholars as Grimm; the great many inconsistencies and anomalies observable could be explained as confusions which have crept into this “logical order” over time.¹³⁶ However, the obvious problems with equating sex and gender, not least that no two languages have an identical gender division, have led many to question the “natural gender” theory. Most late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century analysts tended to look for the origins of grammatical gender in the laws of congruence internal to language, rather than relating the question to the social context of language. Meillet, for example, asserts that the feminine gender is a grammatical category which, in most modern

¹³³ Aristot. *Rhet.* 1407b7.

¹³⁴ *Ars Gramm.* 634b (ed. Uhlig 1883, I, 24-5): γένη μὲν οὖν εἰσι τρία· ἀρσενικόν, θηλυκόν, οὐδέτερον. ἔνιοι δὲ προστιθέασιν τούτοις ἄλλα δύο, κοινόν τε καὶ ἐπίκοινον, κοινὸν μὲν οἷον ἵππος κύων, ἐπίκοινον δὲ οἷον δὲ χελιδὼν ἀετός. Latin grammar early fell under Dionysios' influence, and via Latin most of the modern grammars of Europe are indebted to him. See Robins (1951, 1-68) on Greek and Roman grammatical theory.

¹³⁵ *Nub.* 657-93. On this passage see Loraux 1995, 4-5.

¹³⁶ Cf. Varro *De Lingua Latina* 9.55-62, for a defence of natural gender.

Indo-European languages, holds an important place in morphology, but on the whole has no significance: “Déjà en latin, le genre féminin n’avait plus de signification.”¹³⁷

Adherents of such an approach would hold that grammatical gender has little connection with the way we see the world, but there is plenty of evidence to suggest otherwise.¹³⁸ A sensible treatment of the question can be found in Marina Yaguello’s *Les Mots et les Femmes*, discussing sex and gender in the French language.¹³⁹ She summarises the problem succinctly:

La question qui se pose, comme pour le problème plus général des rapports langue-pensée, est bien celle-ci: Est-ce que nous percevons la mort, la mer, la lune, etc., comme féminines parce que la hasard d’une classification nominale aveugle les a dotées du genre féminin? ou bien, au contraire, sont-ils féminins parce qu’il s’y rattache des valeurs symboliques qui seraient liées aux structures mentales et sociales et aux valeurs culturelles? Problème de la poule et de l’oeuf, pourrait-on dire...¹⁴⁰

In the end, she concludes, the question of the origin of gender is a false problem: whichever way the arrow goes, gender→symbolism or symbolism→gender, the system as we have it certainly does convey an ideology linked to the social status of men and women.¹⁴¹

It is interesting that extremes of good and evil should both be represented in female form, a point made by the Eco quote with which I began this section. At the opposite end of the spectrum from our personified “good things” we might think about the many female monsters of Greek mythology: Skylla and Charybdis, the Sirens and Harpies, Medusa, the Furies, the Chimaira, the Sphinx. Ruth Padel puts our female figures into this context: “Female personifications in classical Greek are a living part of

¹³⁷ Meillet 1938, 24-25: The feminine is a subdivision of the “genre animé”, which covers not only living beings, but is also extended to everything considered “animated”, e.g. earth, tree (opposed to the fruit it bears, which is “inanimée”, neuter gender), hand. “La catégorie une fois créée, on est amené à l’appliquer à travers toute la langue. Le mécanisme grammatical oblige à faire que tout substantif animé soit masculin ou féminin. Et la répartition entre les deux genres peut parfois tenir à très peu de chose.” But even he suspects that in the prehistoric languages which Latin, etc., developed from, the feminine gender *did* have some kind of value, though he does not enlarge on this. Commenting on Meillet (in the same volume), Mauss points out the necessity of taking into account social and psychological factors when studying this question of categorisation.

¹³⁸ See the linguistic and sociological studies cited by Key 1975 and Spender 1990. Many of their points are relevant to our enquiry, especially in so far as they relate questions of linguistic gender to the place of women and the feminine in society.

¹³⁹ Yaguello 1978, 91-113, “Genre et sexe: La métaphore sexuelle”.

¹⁴⁰ Yaguello 1978, 98.

¹⁴¹ Yaguello 1978, 100.

a precise imaginative landscape. This landscape concentrated daemonic danger in female forms, such as Sirens and tragedy's talismanic daemons, the Erinyes."¹⁴² Similarly, extremes of human behaviour often seem to find mythical expression in female form; those "monsters" Klytaimnestra and Medea spring to mind. At the "good" extreme, apart from personified abstractions there are plenty of heroines representing the ultimate in virtue of one sort or another (personifying, in the looser sense): Penelope the chaste, Alkestis the selfless wife. In addition to monsters, the landscape, both real and imaginary, is peopled by more or less beneficent nymphs, all ultimately descended from Earth herself, and of course Olympos has just as many goddesses as gods. In a Judaeo-Christian culture we have become more used to deity being male, though female aspects can be unearthed even here,¹⁴³ but in Greek religion Olympian goddesses do not seem, as a rule, to be especially discriminated against. Given the inferiority of mortal women in Greek thought this might seem surprising, but denigration of female deities is rare. Aristophanes' Peisthetairos and Euelpides touch on the subject when discussing a suitable patron deity for Cloud Cuckoo Land in *Birds*:

Peis.: What's wrong with Athene?

Euel.: Oh, no. You can't expect a well run city if you've got a female goddess standing up there in full armour, while Cleisthenes gets on with his knitting.¹⁴⁴

In the end they decide on the Persian cock, a unequivocally male bird.¹⁴⁵

Although the majority of personifications are female, there are a number of male figures, and we might ask whether there is any significance in their masculinity. The male personifications most often depicted in Greek art are the youthful Erôs and his companions, Himeros and Pothos, though even Erôs seems to have had remarkably little place in cult.¹⁴⁶ Arguably these occupy much the same position as our female

¹⁴² Padel 1992, 161. On the place of Furies in the cosmic order represented in South Italian vase-painting, see Aellen 1994, 24-90.

¹⁴³ See Long (1992) on the history of the figure of Wisdom (feminine *Sophia* in Greek and *Hochma* in Hebrew) in Greek and Near Eastern traditions.

¹⁴⁴ *Birds* 828-331, tr. David Barrett, 1978.

¹⁴⁵ See Loraux 1992 for a discussion of gender difference and the divine. Cf. Blundell 1995, 191 for the suggestion that Athena's "masculine" iconography reflects her problematic status as a powerful female deity.

¹⁴⁶ On Erôs, see Hermay et al. 1986, especially 851, on his cult. See Shapiro (1993, 110-24) on the "ubiquitous triumvirate".

figures, being beautiful young men of a suitable age, potential objects of men's desire.¹⁴⁷ In the Hellenistic period Erôs becomes younger, increasingly represented as the mischievous child of Aphrodite, inspiring desire in others but not an object of desire himself. The only other personification regularly represented as a child is also male: Wealth (Ploutos), whose first appearance is in the arms of Kephisodotos' "Peace holding the child Wealth", in which context I shall discuss him further in chapter six.¹⁴⁸

Erôs and Ploutos, then, though personifications of masculine nouns, are generally represented as youths or children, categories of ambivalent sexuality. Lysippos' famous statue of The Opportune Moment (Kairos) at Sikyon was also a desirable youth, described in an epigram by Poseidippos and represented in later reliefs and gems.¹⁴⁹ The only other male personifications to appear with any frequency in the visual arts are Sleep and Death (Hypnos and Thanatos). On the Chest of Kypselos, as described by Pausanias, they were shown as children in the arms of their mother Night (Nyx), but thereafter they are almost invariably depicted in their Homeric capacity as pall-bearers to Sarpedon.¹⁵⁰ On Euphronios' much-discussed calyx-krater (c.510 BC) they are both mature, bearded men with wings; vase-painters in the second half of the fifth century usually differentiate between the two by making Death older and bearded, often unkempt, Sleep a beardless youth. Such a differentiation surely reflects the idea that Death is a figure to be reckoned with, in contrast to his more obviously desirable younger brother.¹⁵¹ Evidence for their cult is sparse: according to Pausanias Sleep shared an altar at Troizen with the Muses, and he received dedications at Epidauros in his capacity as healer.¹⁵² Plutarch mentions shrines at Sparta of Death and two other

¹⁴⁷ Cf. the relationship between the active/passive opposition and the masculine/feminine distinction in grammatical gender: e.g. the active agent *phylax* is masculine, while the more passive abstract *phylake*, "guarding", is feminine.

¹⁴⁸ See below pp.190-4.

¹⁴⁹ Poseidippos, *AP* 16.275; see Pollitt 1986, 53-4, fig. 47, and Kershaw 1986, ch.3. Pausanias records an altar to Kairos at Olympia (5.14.9), and cf. Alexander Rhetor's analysis of the use of a personified Kairos by Demosthenes in *Olynthiac* 1.2 (above n.27).

¹⁵⁰ Kypselos: Paus. 5.18.1; cf. Hesiod *Theog.* 212. Sarpedon: *Iliad* 16.453-4, 671-2.

¹⁵¹ Euphronios: New York 1972.11.10. See Shapiro (1993, 132-65) for Classical representations of Hypnos/Thanatos. Sleep undergoes a similar process of "juvenation" to Erôs in the Hellenistic period, often being virtually indistinguishable from the latter: see Bazant 1997 and Stafford 1991/3.

¹⁵² Altar at Troizen: Paus. 2.31.3. Epidauros: *IG* IV 1048, 1335, 1336; cf. Paus. 2.10.2. Sleep is invoked as healer at Sophokles, *Philoktetes* 827-32. See Wöhrle 1995, esp. 47-50.

male personification, Fear (Phobos) and Laughter (Gelôs).¹⁵³ The kind of laughter respected at Sparta is clarified by Plutarch's account of Lykourgos' dedication of a statue of Gelôs, indicating that humour could add light relief to a severe life-style, as well as having educational value in making reproof more palatable. Fear's temple at Sparta is described by Pausanias as outside the city, a place where adolescent boys had to sacrifice puppies to Enyalios the night before engaging in a vicious-sounding unarmed combat; Plutarch comments that the Spartans honour Fear as a positive force, "because in their opinion the state is held together above all by Fear".¹⁵⁴ Outside the Spartan context sacrifices to Fear on the eve of battle sound more apotropaic, meant to avert a powerfully disruptive force.¹⁵⁵

Two male personifications of traits which one might categorise as vices are Hesitation (Oknos) and Envy (Phthonos), though neither has an extensive iconography. The former appeared in Polygnotos' painting of the Underworld in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi; Pausanias refers to him as "a man the inscription says is Hesitation", suggesting that he was not a familiar figure; he was apparently represented as a seated man plaiting a rope, which a she-ass ate as he worked, but no further indication of his appearance is given.¹⁵⁶ Envy, on the other hand, is explicitly of undesirable appearance in Lucian's description of Apelles' allegorical painting *Slander*.¹⁵⁷ Envy stands before the throne of a king, who is flanked by Ignorance and Suspicion (Agnōia, Hypolepsis), while Slander (Diabole) drags her unfortunate victim forward, attended by Treachery and Deceit (Epiboule, Apate), and followed at a distance by Repentance (Metanoia), who turns to look at Truth (Aletheia). Envy, clothed in black, is the only male personification in the scene: "a pale, ugly man who has a piercing eye and looks as if he had wasted away in long illness".

¹⁵³ Temples at Sparta to Thanatos, Phobos and Gelôs: Plut. *Kleom.* 9. Statue of Gelôs: Plut. *Lyk.* 25.; cf. statues of Hypnos and Thanatos at Sparta (Paus. 3.18.1).

¹⁵⁴ Phobos at Sparta: Paus. 3.14.9, Plut. *Kleom.* 9. On Sparta's cults to predominantly male personifications, see Richer (forthcoming). On the "Spartan-ness" of a cult of Fear, see Parker 1989, 162.

¹⁵⁵ Sacrifices to Fear: Plut. *Thes.* 27, *Alex.* 31, Appian *Pun.* 21. Phobos is also among the deities listed as responsible for Selinous' victory at IG XIV 268 (ML 38).

¹⁵⁶ Paus. 10.29.1. See Shapiro 1993, 178-9 on this and another possible representation of Oknos (black-figure lekythos, Palermo 996).

¹⁵⁷ *On not being quick to believe slander*, 6-8. Botticelli's *Calumny of Apelles*, in the Uffizi, follows Lucian's description closely, except for the figure of Truth; see Warner 1985, 316-7.

Personifications in adult male form, then, are often of equivocal or even negative values, but the main point is their scarcity. For the most part literary and artistic tradition demands that abstract qualities, positive or negative, should be represented in female form. A good example of the strength of this tradition can be seen in the story recorded by Kallisthenes, quoted by Athenaios, about Limos, “Famine”; the word is usually masculine in gender, though there are occasional instances of ἡ λιμὸς (fem.) in Doric dialects.¹⁵⁸ According to Kallisthenes, when the Arkadians were besieging the small town of Kromnos, one of the Spartans under siege managed to send a message back to Sparta via a riddle: the woman imprisoned in the temple of Apollo must be liberated within ten days, as she would no longer be capable of liberation after this time. The riddle is explained:

For this “woman” is in the temple of Apollo beside Apollo’s throne, being a painted representation of Famine in the likeness of a woman. And so it became clear to all that the men in the besieged town were able to hold out only ten days on account of famine (διὰ τὸν λιμόν).¹⁵⁹

For Kallisthenes the masculine gender for *limos* was clearly the norm, but he makes no comment on the anomaly of Famine’s female form.

A more confused case is that of the masculine Eleos, “Mercy”. A number of our later Greek sources seem to be unhappy with the masculine, and use Φιλανθρωπία instead, a word obviously associated conceptually, though not exactly a synonym.¹⁶⁰ Eleos’ masculinity is even more of a problem for Latin authors: an accurate translation of ἔλεος is, of course, the feminine *misericordia*, with *clementia* as a possible alternative; there is no suitable equivalent which would keep the masculine.¹⁶¹ Statius’ description of the altar of *Clementia* in the Athenian Agora raises a potential problem in describing Mercy’s cult statue, but, fortunately for Statius,

¹⁵⁸ Used e.g. by the Megarian in Aristoph. *Acharn.* 743.

¹⁵⁹ Kallisthenes, *ap.* Athen. 10.452b (*FGrH* 124 F13): αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Ἀπολλωνίῳ παρὰ τὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος θρόνον διὰ γραφῆς ἀπομεμιμημένος Λιμὸς ἔχων γυναικὸς μορφήν. φανερόν οὖν ἐγένετο πᾶσιν ὅτι δέκα ἡμέρας ἔτι καρτερῆσαι δύνανται οἱ πολιορκούμενοι διὰ τὸν λιμόν. See West 1966, 231 (*ad Theog.* 227) for further references to Limos personified: “the gender of the word and the sex of the god are variable”.

¹⁶⁰ See Apsines and Sopatros (below pp.210 and 227).

¹⁶¹ See e.g. Quintilian and Seneca (below pp.210 and 231). Cf. καιρὸς/*occasio* for Greek/Latin gender-crossing.

there is no such thing: “There is no image, the goddess’ form is entrusted to no metal”.¹⁶²

Problems of representation obviously also arise with personifications of nouns which are neuter in gender. Geras, Old Age, appears only on five vases from the first half of the fifth century, all depicting Herakles’ confrontation with him, a story for which no literary account survives. Geras is represented as an old man in every case, being particularly wizened and deformed, leaning on a walking-stick, on pelikai in the Louvre and Villa Giulia.¹⁶³ Penthos, Grief, has human form implied by the fable, attributed by Plutarch to Aisop, which makes it/him ask Zeus for a share in the honours being handed out to the gods. The Greek is equivocal, Grief being designated only once by a personal pronoun in the dative, αὐτῷ, which could of course be masculine or neuter, but English translations are obliged to designate Grief as “he” in order to maintain the personification.¹⁶⁴ It would be interesting to know how Kratos was represented in the original production of the *Prometheus Bound*. Its/his companion Bia was presumably female, though masculinity might be expected of “Force” acting as guard of the captive Prometheus; the character is silent, however, in contrast to Kratos, who has a lengthy exchange with Hephaistos in the opening scene of the play.¹⁶⁵ The pair were apparently depicted in the context of the punishment of Ixion on a fragmentary late fifth-century skyphos in a private collection in Basel, but unfortunately all that survives is Bia’s hand and the two inscriptions.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶² *Theb.* 12.492-3; see below pp.215-16. Wycherley (1954, 148) comments that the lack of a statue is lucky for Statius “otherwise the slight difficulty of the gender of the deity (...) might have become acute”.

¹⁶³ Louvre G234, *ARV*² 286,16; Villa Giulia 48238, *ARV*² 284,1; see Shapiro 1993, 89-94, nos. 34-8.

¹⁶⁴ *Consolation to his Wife* §6, e.g. tr. Russell 1993, 299-300; the fable does not appear in Hausrath’s edition of the *Corpus Fabularum Aesopicarum* (Leipzig 1956-9). At *Consolation to Apollonius*, 112a, Plutarch attributes the story to “a philosopher”, comforting Queen Arsinoe; see F.C. Babbitt’s translation of Penthos here as “she” (Loeb, 1928). See above p.43 on Plutarch and allegory.

¹⁶⁵ *P.V.* 1-87; on the disputed date and authorship of the play see Griffith 1977 and Bees 1993. A production for the London Festival of Greek Drama 1998 by Chloë Productions played both Kratos and Bia as male; some practical problems of the chaining sequence are discussed by Dyson 1994.

¹⁶⁶ Collection of Herbert Cahn, HC 541; Shapiro 1993, no.110. Shapiro comments that *kratos* could “easily be taken for masculine” with its -os ending and “this was clearly not a problem that worried the Greeks” (167).

In *Monuments and Maidens*, Marina Warner discusses the “allegory of the female form” in the Classical Tradition.¹⁶⁷ She argues that while at first female form of personified virtues was an accident of grammatical gender, iconography took hold, perpetuating the tradition. In addition to this, a further rationale for depicting concepts in female form is provided by the female figures of Greek myth, especially Athena; this affixing of meaning to the female form, she suggests, can be seen today in advertising.¹⁶⁸ Her account is persuasive, but the argument needs to be taken further back. Literary and artistic tradition did indeed perpetuate a female iconography for personified abstractions, but this iconography has its roots in attitudes towards the feminine. In a male-dominated society extremes of both good and evil tend to be represented in female form, as “the other”; further, it is noticeable that all the personified “good things” we have seen are either handsome youths or beautiful young women of marriageable age.¹⁶⁹ Is it too fanciful to suggest that they are so represented because both abstract and image are indeed objects of men’s desire? In Prodikos’ “Choice of Herakles” the superficially desirable Vice is described in explicitly sexual terms, appealing to the hero to take the option of a life of decadence and indulgence.¹⁷⁰ Aristophanes makes play with just this connection with the silent female characters in several plays who are leered at by the men on stage: the “Peace-treaties” (Spondai) of the *Knights*, “Reconciliation” (Diallage) in the *Lysistrata*, “Vintage” and “Festival-going” (Opora and Theoria) in the *Peace*.¹⁷¹ While the very fact that women have a low profile makes the female form a practically suitable vehicle for abstract ideas in search of an incarnation, psychologically their desirable form conveys the desirability of the abstract values they embody.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁷ Warner 1985, especially 63-87, “Engendered Images”.

¹⁶⁸ Warner 1985, 85-6: “Divorced from the religion that gave her worship, disinfected of pagan cult and ritual, Athena provided the mould in which the language of virtue was cast...”. Warner 1985, 85-6.

¹⁶⁹ Homer’s Litai are the only female personifications to be characterised as elderly, their age in relation to Ate dictated by the logic of the allegory (*Il.* 9.502-12).

¹⁷⁰ Prodikos fr.2 DK (*Xen. Mem.* II 1, 21-34); on Herakles’ encounter, see Fox 1998, 13-19. Cf. Lucian’s parody, which presents the young Lucian with the choice between Education (Paideia) and the Art of Statuary (Hermoglyphike), *Dream* 6-9.

¹⁷¹ Σπονδαί, *Equ.* 1389 ff.; Διαλλαγή, *Lys.* 1114 ff.; see below pp.198-201 on the *Peace*.

¹⁷² Cf. Rodgers 1995 on the “non-specificity” of female images in Romano-British mosaics, and Jesnick 1992, 297-328.

IV. DEIFIED ABSTRACTIONS AS A CLASS

ANCIENT ANALYSIS

Although allegorical interpretations and general criticisms of the Olympian gods are plentiful in Greek speculative writing,¹⁷³ explicit discussion of deified abstractions is scarcely to be found before the Roman period, when it is extremely difficult to disentangle the Greek and Roman religious contexts of the phenomenon, obscuring possible differences between the two. The absence of such discussion from Plato is perhaps particularly surprising, given the obvious parallelism between deified abstractions and the Platonic Forms: as Dover puts it, “Plato’s ‘ideas’ are, historically speaking, the progeny of the personified abstractions who thronged the suburbs of Olympus”.¹⁷⁴ In Plato’s account of his last days in prison, Sokrates himself employs just the kind of trope discussed in later rhetorical treatises when explaining to his friends why he will not even try to escape from Athens. He conjures up a dialogue between himself and the city’s Laws (Nomoi), who convince him that he should abide by the state’s judgements and face the prescribed death penalty; Sokrates concludes that he should follow the course indicated by ὁ θεός, but it is by no means clear how “the god” relates to the rhetorical personifications who have been its mouthpiece.¹⁷⁵ Even in the *Symposium*, with its extensive discussion of the nature of love, and such questions as whether Love is oldest or youngest of the gods, Erôs’ status as a personification is not addressed; Diotima’s account of his birth from a union between Contrivance (Poros), son of Invention (Metis), and Poverty (Penia) implicitly suggests his allegorical nature, but his divinity as such is never disputed.¹⁷⁶

Cicero, however, has plenty to say on the subject of deified abstractions in the *Laws*. The religious laws of his ideal state include an injunction to worship not only “those who have always lived in heaven”, but also “those qualities through which an ascent to heaven is granted to man: Intellect, Virtue, Piety, Faith”.¹⁷⁷ It is a good thing

¹⁷³ See Muir 1985 for a succinct general account of Greek religious scepticism.

¹⁷⁴ Dover 1980, 7.

¹⁷⁵ *Crito* 50a-54e. On the trope, see above pp.24-5.

¹⁷⁶ *Sym.* 203b-204a; cf. Plut. *On Isis and Osiris* 57 (574d). Poros also appears in the cosmogonic fragments associated with Alkman: *PMG*² 5 (*P.Oxy.* 2390) fr.2 col.iii; see above n.51.

¹⁷⁷ *De Leg.* 2.19.9: *Diuos et eos qui caelestes semper habiti sunt colunto et illos quos endo caelo merita </>ocauerint, Herculem, Liberum, Aesculapium, Castorem, Pollucem, Quirinum, ast olla propter quae datur homini<bus> ascensus in caelum, Mentem, Virtutem, Pietatem, Fidem, earumque laudum delubra sunt nec ulla uitiorum sacra sollemnia obeunto.*

for such virtues to be “arbitrarily deified”, as they have been in Rome, because then the good men who possess them “may believe that the gods themselves are established within their own souls”; on the same ethical note, we should give our gods names of “things which we should desire, such as Health, Honour, Wealth and Victory”.¹⁷⁸ Vices, however, should not be worshipped, and the existing altars in Rome to Fever, Bad Fortune and “all abominations of that kind” must be removed.¹⁷⁹ In the *De Natura Deorum*, Cicero puts both sides of the argument. Stoic doctrine, which is basically in favour of the deification of abstractions, is outlined by Balbus, who describes two complementary processes. Either the gift of a god may be given the god’s name, as Ceres’ gift of corn can be called “cereal”, or

in other cases some thing in which particularly great power resides may itself be designated by the title “god”, like Faith and Intellect, whom we see recently dedicated on the Capitol by Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, and indeed Faith had previously been deified by Aulus Atilius Calatinus. You see the temple of Virtue, you see that of Honour, restored by Marcus Marcellus, which was dedicated many years before by Quintus Maximus in the time of the Ligurian war. And what of Wealth, of Health, of Concord, Liberty, Victory? Because the power of all these things was so great that it could not be governed without godhead, the things themselves acquired the title of gods. In the same class the names of Desire, Pleasure and Venus Lubentina have been deified, vicious and unnatural things (even if Velleius thinks otherwise), but nonetheless these vices often strike more powerfully than nature.¹⁸⁰

The argument that some abstract “things” just seem too powerful *not* to be gods is compelling in its simplicity, and I shall have cause to return to it below. The Academic Cotta, however, is not impressed, and demolishes the Stoic position by a *reductio ad absurdum*, representing the crowd of ridiculous deities that are let in by allowing any gods to exist. He concludes that abstract forces are powerful and may even be

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 2.28.13: ... rerumque expetendarum nomina, Salutis, Honoris, Opis, Victoriae, quoniamque exspectatione rerum bonarum erigitur animus...

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 2.28.11: Virtutes enim, non vitia consecrar<i> decet. Araque uetusta in Palatio Febris et altera Esquiliis Malae Fortunae detestataque omnia eiusmodi repudianda sunt.

¹⁸⁰ *De Natura Deorum* 2.23.61: tum autem res ipsa in qua vis inest maior aliqua sic appellatur ut ea ipsa nominetur deus, ut Fides, ut Mens, quas in Capitolio dedicatas videmus proxime a M. Aemilio Scauro, ante autem ab A. Atilio Calatino erat Fides consecrata. vides Virtutis templum, vides Honoris a M. Marcello renovatum quod multis annis erat bello Ligustico a Q. Maximo dedicatum. quid Opis, quid Salutis, quid Concordiae Libertatis Victoriae? quarum omnium rerum quia vis erat tanta ut sine deo regi non posset, ipsa res deorum nomen obtinuit. quo ex genere Cupidinis et Voluptatis et Lubentinae Veneris vocabula consecrata sunt, vitiosarum rerum neque naturalium (quamquam Velleius aliter existimat), sed tamen ea ipsa vitia natura vehementius saepe pulsan.

desirable, but they are either human qualities within our own characters or objects of our desire — a view which provides the starting point for this chapter.¹⁸¹

A hundred years later, Pliny the Elder is even more cynical, his tone becoming decidedly satirical as he includes personifications in a general dismissal of traditional religion. For him it is “a mark of human weakness” to attribute any form to God, and to believe in countless deified abstractions, especially personified vices, “reaches even greater heights of stupidity”.¹⁸² Not only is the entire traditional pantheon a human fantasy, but even if a supreme being existed it would hardly be interested in men’s affairs. Belief in any kind of god(s) is merely the result of wishful thinking.¹⁸³ The idea is echoed by Juvenal’s comment on Fortuna: “You would have no divinity, Fortune, if we had any sense; it is we, we ourselves who make you into a goddess and set you in heaven”.¹⁸⁴ Lucian’s satirical council of gods particularly blames the philosophers for this arbitrary invention of abstract deities. They receive a great deal of the worship that should be being paid to the proper gods, despite being absent from heaven and indeed “unable to exist at all as realities”: “Where is that much talked about Virtue, and Nature and Destiny and Fortune, insubstantial and empty names of things dreamed up by those bleating philosophers...?”¹⁸⁵

Not surprisingly, St Augustine’s Christian assessment of the phenomenon is particularly scathing about “that crowd of minute gods”, the deified abstractions who represent “all that ought to be done” and “all that ought to be desired”.¹⁸⁶ Having ridiculed the temple of Concordia as being built on a site of notorious *discord*, he proceeds to debunk the host of deities apparently necessary for the preservation and

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.* 3.17.43-7, 3.24.61.

¹⁸² *NH* 2.14: *Quapropter effigiem dei formamque quaerere inbecillitatis humanae reor. quisquis est deus, si modo est alius, et quacumque in parte, totus est sensus, totus visus, totus auditus, totus animae, totus animi, totus sui. innumeros quidem credere atque etiam ex vitiis hominum, ut Pudicitiam, Concordiam, Mentem, Spem, Honorem, Clementiam, Fidem, aut, ut Democrito placuit, duos omnino, Poenam et Beneficium, maiorem ad socordiam accedit.*

¹⁸³ *NH* 2.26.

¹⁸⁴ *Satire* 10.365-6: *nullum numen habes, si sit prudentia: nos te, / nos facimus, Fortuna, deam caeloque locamus.*

¹⁸⁵ *Conc. Deo.* 13: ἡ ποῦ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ πολυθρύλητος ἀρετὴ καὶ φύσις καὶ εἰμαρμένη καὶ τύχη, ἀνυπόστατα καὶ κενὰ πραγμάτων ὀνόματα ὑπὸ βλακῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν φιλοσόφων ἐπινοηθέντα...

¹⁸⁶ *City of God* 4.9 and 21.

extension of the Roman Empire.¹⁸⁷ He then poses a very good question: if such qualities as Virtus and Fides have been deified, why not other important virtues? Perhaps, he suggests, particular virtues like *temperantia*, *fortitudo*, *prudentia* and *sapientia* are all included under the general heading of Virtus; but in that case they might as well be regarded as aspects of the one God.¹⁸⁸ Pursuing the logic of his argument he concludes: “Not truth, but stupidity has created these goddesses; they are in fact the gifts of the true God, not gods themselves.”¹⁸⁹ A little later he admits that the existence of personification cults could even help to convert some people, if they were only intelligent enough to realise that the names they worshipped really belonged to the gift desired rather than to any possible giver.

MODERN THEORIES

Modern commentators echo some of these ideas and add further theories. The question of the origins of deified abstractions is closely related to the whole problem of the development of personal gods and their names: were the gods originally concepts which have become deified, or are abstract ideas “de-personalised” gods? Usener’s extreme thesis that language originally possessed no abstracts at all but an array of “Augenblicksgötter” and “Sondergötter” has long been discarded, but the origins of particular personifications have still been sought in the “Abstraktifizierung von Dämonen”, as we shall see in the case of Themis.¹⁹⁰ Since personifications appear alongside their abstract noun in Homer, however, and we have no real evidence for thought patterns before Homer, the “chicken and egg” question seems likely to remain vexed.¹⁹¹ Burkert more practically sees the relationship between abstract and deity as a two-way process, emphasising the importance of epic in “fixing” the gods: “Insofar as divine names are meaningful, the boundary between name and concept is fluid; it is only the process of Homerization that set up a clear delimitation here.”¹⁹²

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 3.25-6, 4.8-19. Instances of discord at various levels are of course frequently the occasion for worshipping Concordia/Homonoia: see Thériault 1996 *passim*.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 4.20.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 4.21: *has deas non veritas, sed vanitas facit; haec enim veri Dei munera sunt, non ipsae sunt deae*.

¹⁹⁰ Usener 1896, 364 ff.; see Farnell 1907 for summary and criticism; on Usener, see Bremmer 1990. Cf. Deubner 1902-9, 2068-9.

¹⁹¹ Dietrich 1988, 26: “It is impossible to determine whether the personal evolved from the impersonal concept”, or *vice versa*.

¹⁹² Burkert 1985a, 185,

Aside from the more general question, then, the first strand of interpretation seeks to explain a cult personification in terms of her close relationship with a more personal deity. Deubner espouses the most straightforward version of this, what we might call the “epithet theory”, which understands a personification as an aspect of a personal deity, which has developed into an independent figure via a stage as a cult title. He suggests that the majority of Greek deified abstractions developed in this way, claiming that Dike and Nemesis, for example, are only understandable if taken in an adjectival sense, “the directing” and “the apportioning” goddesses; he reverses the progression for Roman personifications, which he sees as “lifeless” attempts to animate abstract ideas, never really leaving the conceptual sphere.¹⁹³ Writing around the same time, Axtell is rather wary of the epithet theory in respect of Roman personification cults, seeing it as only a partial explanation, and not universally applicable: “It is, however, so sure and convincing a cause in a few instances that it has been seized upon as a satisfactory explanation for them all, and nearly all writers on the subject apparently go on the principle: Given a deified appellative, find its original personal or concrete parent.”¹⁹⁴ Farnell is likewise cautious in applying the epithet theory to all Greek personification cults, proposing the variation that abstract names might become attached to older cults; he expands on this by suggesting that Hebe at Phlious and Erôs at Thespiiai might have begun as local fertility gods, but without offering any hypothesis as to how such a superposition might have come about.¹⁹⁵ More recently Mark has seen evidence for such an annexation of an older cult by a younger in the name Athena Nike: “such fused titles are usually thought to arise from the annexation or assimilation of a preexisting local cult by a major god”.¹⁹⁶ In the case of Athena Nike it would have to be the personification who came first; Mark cannot definitely demonstrate such preexistence for Nike, but he favours the idea to the “text-based hypothesis” that personifications originated as epithets. Clearly this approach leaves the question of the personification’s origins unanswered, but it is a possible model for

¹⁹³ Deubner 1902-9, 2069-70, 2078.

¹⁹⁴ Axtell 1987/07, 64; see 59-67 for a full review of earlier discussions of Roman deification of abstract ideas.

¹⁹⁵ Farnell 1896-1909, V, 444.

¹⁹⁶ Mark 1993, 127-8.

explaining the striking noun-noun combination of such cult appellations as *Ge Themis*, *Aphrodite Peitho* and *Athena Hygieia*, all of whom I shall be considering below.¹⁹⁷

An alternative scenario picks up on Balbus' idea that even "vicious and unnatural things" may be so powerful that they become deified, a theory which helps to explain the presence of a number of "negative" values in the realm of cult. In such figures as *Aidôs*, *Eleos*, *Gelôs* and *Phobos* Farnell recognises "a different religious phenomenon" from that which applies to *Hebe* and *Erôs*, one that come from the sphere of magic and polydaimonism; he derives these deities from the primitive psychological process which externalises a strong emotion and identifies it with some divine causative power.¹⁹⁸ A more deliberate process of externalisation can be seen in the approach which suggests that cults of personified ideas were a response to the need for an ethical element otherwise lacking in Greek and Roman religion. Farnell, again, notes that many personification cults represent such moral ideas, and that they are mostly "of late emergence", but draws no conclusions.¹⁹⁹ Commenting on Roman religion, Litchfield sees deified abstractions very much in this light, their cults introduced as part of an attempt to remedy the lack of morality in the traditional religious system:

The ancient divinities were made to denounce the moral vices, and themselves endowed, more or less successfully, with moral attributes. The creation of supplementary deities, purely moral, *Fides*, *Concordia*, *Pudicitia*, and the like — a phenomenon too familiar to need more than a passing mention — is perhaps testimony at once to the original incompetency in this respect of the elder divinities, and to the inadequate success of the Roman state in their reformation.²⁰⁰

Lind also adopts the need-for-morality model, following Deubner in positing that Roman personification cults developed in the opposite way to Greek ones, the abstract concept coming first and being deliberately deified.²⁰¹ In a later piece he speaks of a "Roman inclination toward the formation of abstract conceptions" as an inheritance "from the Indo-European past", and hints that the personification of such abstractions

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Thériault (1996, 35, 39 and 188) on attestations of *Demeter Homonoia*, *Aphrodite Homonoia* and an *Artemis Thermia Homonoia*.

¹⁹⁸ Farnell 1896-1909, V, 444-5. Cf. Deubner 1902-9, 2071-2, and Hani 1980 (on *Aidos*).

¹⁹⁹ Farnell 1896-1909, V, 446.

²⁰⁰ Litchfield 1914, 19.

²⁰¹ Lind 1973-4.

is also a “primitive survival”, though he adduces little evidence.²⁰² For Greek cults a similar hypothesis, expounded by Reinhardt and Hamdorf, sees personification cults developing to fill gaps in the effective sphere of the old gods, responding to the changing political and ethical needs of society.²⁰³

This approach is developed, sometimes in combination with variations on the epithet theory, by a well-represented school of thought which sees deified abstractions as representing a rationalising compromise between religion and philosophy, allowing the idea of one God to coexist with many gods, part of the same trend as the allegorical interpretation of the traditional Olympian gods and mythological tales. Thus Nilsson argues that personifications gained importance from the second half of the fifth century as compatible with, but more accessible than, an indeterminate θεός or τὸ θεῖον.²⁰⁴ Burkert places the beginnings of the process earlier, adducing the Indo-Iranian parallel of Mithras (“Contract”) for the antiquity of the worship of gods designated by abstract concepts.²⁰⁵ Thanks to Homerisation, archaic Greek personifications “come to assume their distinctive character in that they mediate between the individual gods and their spheres of reality”. He sees a progression from the appearance of personifications in poetry to their representation in the visual arts, whence they “finally find their way into the realm of cult” towards the end of the archaic period, reflecting an increasing scepticism about the gods of poetry: “Of the existence and actuality of the Homeric gods there can be no proof, but no man of intelligence can dispute the importance of the phenomena and situations designated by

²⁰² Lind 1976, 258 and 245. He is drawing generally on Dumézil 1949, though the latter makes no specific mention of personification. Cf. Axtell (1987/1907, 64): “the habit of personifying and deifying a quality or condition independently of other gods was inherent in the Roman character”. Cf. Ferguson (1970, 72-3) on the use of personifications as propaganda in the imperial period.

²⁰³ Reinhardt 1966, Hamdorf 1964 (and see Haussmann 1966). Cf. Cornford’s discussion (1907, 221-43).

²⁰⁴ Nilsson 1950, 39: “Der Durbruch des Kultes des Personifikationen im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. ist ein Zeichen der Zeit, der Aushöhlung der alten Religion... Man wendet sich an die göttliche Macht, von der die Personifikation einen Ausschnitt darstellt.” He applies the “epithet theory” to pre-fourth century cults (e.g. Philia develops from Zeus Philios), though he grants the single fifth-century exception of PHEME.

²⁰⁵ Burkert 1985a, 185. Cf. the personifications of Sumerian dispute poems, which include inanimate objects (Hoe vs. Plough, Copper vs. Silver, Upper vs. Lower Millstone) as well as natural phenomena; see van Dijk 1953 (French translation of texts) and Vanstiphout 1991. See Gaster (1950, 115-222) on the personifications of the Canaanite *Poem of Baal*, such as Cunning and Death.

abstract terms.”²⁰⁶ Humphreys gives a similar account of the place of personification cults in a more general process of rationalisation and secularisation beginning around 550 BC. On the one hand “more abstract conceptions of deity were developed: if gods have no bodies, their existence cannot be empirically disproved.”²⁰⁷ On the other, prominence was given to the more rational elements of existing gods, by giving Zeus the cult title “Saviour”, for example, and by the introduction of personifications of philosophically defensible concepts: “There is a gradual shift of emphasis in cult... from archaic aspects of the gods which had come to seem incomprehensible to personifications of the blessings which men hoped for.”²⁰⁸

The most recent commentators on personification in Greek art seem not to find the figures particularly problematic as a class. Shapiro reviews various opinions on the development of personification cults, but is basically content to state that “the Greeks and Romans, who felt themselves surrounded by countless divine and supernatural powers, naturally made things and ideas into gods, durable and individualized divinities who might take their place in the great pantheon.”²⁰⁹ Similarly, Aellen sees the ambivalent status of personifications as symptomatic of a more general Greek mindset: “Ce va-et-vient constant de l’élément (ou de l’abstraction) à la divinité constitue la base même de la pensée mythologique.”²¹⁰ Amy Smith, discussing Athenian document reliefs, concludes that the local personifications represented thereon are really no different in kind from figures attested in cult:

The Greeks regarded every entity or concept as possessing a spirit, which was frequently made more intelligible by its translation into a human form, through the process of personification. All of these personifications thus represent spirits, most of which fell short of receiving worship or a cult. The point at which the Athenians

²⁰⁶ Burkert 1985a, 185-6; see 246-50, on the gods and morality. Parker (1996, 234-6) suggests that independence from the Olympian sphere may plausibly be a new feature of personification cults in the fourth century, though he notes the problematic fifth-century cases of PHEME and Eukleia.

²⁰⁷ Humphreys 1986, 96.

²⁰⁸ Ibid. 102. Cf. Kershaw (1986, ch.5, 81) on the place of personification cults in the Hellenistic period: “Religion has not declined; religious consciousness has been reorganised in order to fulfil the needs of the people living in the changed world”. Lewis (1936, 52) similarly sees personifications as occupying a position capable of philosophical interpretation, ensuring their survival of the transition from paganism to Christianity: “the twilight of the gods is the mid-morning of the personifications”.

²⁰⁹ Shapiro 1993, 12-14.

²¹⁰ Aellen 1994, 13. Aellen is much concerned with the “status question” (see especially 82-90 and 173-8) but his complex categorisations would be difficult to apply beyond the realms of South Italian ceramics; he concludes elegantly, if unhelpfully, that personifications are “concrètes abstraites, divines profanes, réelles irréelles” (193).

decided that a particular spirit or force was divine, and deserved worship or cult, is difficult, or impossible, for us to determine.²¹¹

There is much sense in these views in general terms, which certainly suffice as a background for the iconographical studies which are their authors' focus, but they do not address the more chronologically and geographically particular questions likely to be asked by social historians.

A recent investigation which *is* concerned with such questions, however, is Thériault's study of the cult of Homonoia, in conclusion to which he discusses political personification cults more generally.²¹² He sees such cults as reflecting "les thèmes de l'heure" (e.g. concord, democracy, peace), political ideals "que l'on crut sans doute consolider... en les sacralsant. Mais cette divinisation de notions abstraites répondait à un besoin pressant, celui de faire face aux nouvelles réalités, alors que l'on recherchait désespérément paix, concorde et démocratie."²¹³ Thériault is critical of those, such as Nilsson and Burkert, who have denied religious seriousness to fourth-century and later personification cults: "Je crois que ces cultes, avec leurs temples, leurs autels, leurs sacrifices, leur prêtres et, dans certaines cités, leur inscription aux calendriers sacrificiels — au moins pour *Homonoia* — eurent certainement, malgré leur nature essentiellement politique, un caractère religieux."²¹⁴ He explicitly poses the question of the place of political personifications in the pantheon, suggesting that they should be seen as occupying a lower position in the hierarchy than the great Olympian gods, but essentially only differentiated by their relatively restricted sphere of influence; they belong in the category of minor divinities, *daimones*, "qui agissent dans une sphère déterminée et que l'on caractérise par une activité particulière".²¹⁵ Their relative insignificance in myth does not necessarily reflect their position in cult, where they may often have played an important part in the religious life of the community, being "plus près de la réalité quotidienne" than the Olympian gods. Thériault has

²¹¹ Smith 1997, 187.

²¹² Thériault 1996, 182-8. The case of Homonoia is unusual in having a chronological *terminus post quem* provided by the fact that the word *homonoia* is not attested before Thucydides (8.75.2).

²¹³ Thériault 1996, 183.

²¹⁴ Thériault 1996, 184.

²¹⁵ Thériault 1996, 186-7.

certainly demonstrated the truth of this proposition in the case of Homonoia; whether it can be more generally applied is part of the current investigation.

In the following chapters these theories will be tried out on six individual personifications. Themis and Nemesis are both fully developed characters with a mythological role to complement their place in cult. Themis in particular has attracted interpretation by various forms of the epithet theory, while the fact that she appears in Homer makes her a good test-case for the development of personification cults in the archaic period. Nemesis provides an example of a cult which in its early stages appears to be restricted to a specific locality, allowing interpretation in the light of particular historical circumstances; she is also the only personification for whom we have a firmly identified sanctuary and cult statue, as well as occupying a particularly grey area between myth and more “rational” modes of thought. Peitho and Hygieia, though having only minor mythological roles, are both brought within the Olympian sphere by their close associations with major gods, Peitho with Aphrodite, Hygieia with both Athena and Asklepios, once again raising the possibility of applying the epithet theory. For Peitho we have a substantial body of representation in Attic vase-painting to complement more direct evidence for her cult in Athens, in addition to attestations of cult elsewhere in the Greek world. Hygieia’s cult is even more widely attested, while the fact that the concept she embodies is so very much a “good thing” might seem to invite the question of how seriously she could be taken in human form. Similarly, the overtly political figure of Eirene has often been seen as empty propaganda or, with Ploutos in her arms, as allegory rather than as a seriously worshipped deity. Finally, the elusive Eleos raises in acute form the methodological problems involved in matching literary personifications with the archaeological record, as well as being firmly tied to a specific location. In my conclusion I shall return to the general questions raised in this chapter, on the origins and chronological development of personification cults as a class, the place of deified abstractions in the Greek pantheon and their “reality” for the worshipper, their implications for our understanding of such figures in art and literature, and their significance for the myth/*logos* debate.

Chapter 2

THEMIS: ARCHAIC PERSONIFICATION AND THE EPITHET THEORY¹

In the archaic period the few personifications reliably attested in cult are mostly at the “less abstract” end of the scale, having some mythological role to make them seem thoroughly anthropomorphic. As a character already established on Olympos in Homer, Themis is a good example of such an early figure, as well as embodying an important archaic concept. Studies of the abstract noun in Homer and later literature suggests θέμις particularly signified the right that every leader has to speak freely in the assembly, more generally indicating the established customs upon which a political community is based; ἀθέμιστος is used of a man who does not recognise this moral principle (*Il.* 9.63), while the construction θέμις ἐστὶ indicates the norm, the law which naturally rules a determined social group.² If Themis is the personification of such “right”, “established custom”, “social order”, her cult has obvious potential ethical and political implications.³ The case of Themis also provides a good illustration of the methodological problems surrounding the question of the origins and early development of personification cults. She seems in one or two locations to be closely associated with Ge/Gaia, at first sight an unlikely combination, and the association has given rise to the hypothesis that she may have originated as an epithet of Ge, representing a particular aspect of Earth’s influence. Farnell favours the idea because

¹ This chapter started life as a paper at *The Development of the Archaic Polis*, Durham, September 1995, and a much abbreviated version appears in the proceedings (Stafford 1997a); many of those present at the conference made helpful suggestions, especially George Robertson and Lin Foxhall. In addition to the usual lexicographical entries, Themis has attracted a number of monographs, from as early as Stephanus Pighius’ *Themis Dea* of 1568, a study of both the goddess and the concept in Greek literature, inspired by a representation of Themis as a herm he had seen at Rome (drawing p.23). Themis is considered alongside Dike “und Verwandtes” in Hirzel 1907 and Ehrenberg 1921, both concerned with “Rechtsidee” in Greek thought. Vos 1956 gives equal attention to idea and goddess, providing a useful survey of literary usage. Corsano 1988 develops an interesting argument linking *T/themis* with the fortunes of the *gene*, taking the *P.V.* as her point of departure. The most recent discussion of Themis’ iconography is Karanastassi 1997, who catalogues 33 representations, though the identity of many of these is speculative.

² Wees (1992, 322 n.1) defines Homeric *themis* as both “(divine) law” and “the place where/meeting at which matters of law are discussed” (e.g. *Od.* 9.112). See Vos 1956, 1-38 for full discussion, with useful reviews by Defradas (1958) and Valk (1959). Vos tries to distinguish Homeric θέμις from δίκη, arguing that θέμις defines fundamental rights, δίκη applies to a right valid within the community, in opposition to βία (30-31). For an account of the operation of Homeric δίκαι and θέμιστες, see Murray 1993, 58-60.

³ Corsano (1988, 6) sees Themis as representing the orally transmitted norms of an aristocratic society: “La divinità femminile che con il termine Themis è designata, esprime, nella dimensione mitica e culturale, l’elaborazione della realtà giuridica e dell’ordinamento politico che le *thémistes* rappresentano.”

he deems improbable “the only other conceivable theory, that Themis began her religious career as the mere personification of the abstract idea of righteousness”.⁴ Latte adopts a variation on the epithet theory with the hypothesis that Themis was originally an earth divinity identical with Ge, who later became an abstraction, circumventing the obvious linguistic problem that θέμις is not an adjective.⁵ Reinhardt discusses the question of the direction of Themis’ development — earth goddess to abstract or *vice versa* — at greater length, but comes to the same conclusion.⁶ If Themis did indeed start life as an aspect of Ge, her gaining of autonomy could be understood as a reflection of a shift in emphasis, from an agrarian concern with fertility and natural justice to an increasingly urban concern with law and political order, alongside the rise of the archaic *polis*.⁷ Whether such a development can be traced, however, remains to be seen.

THEMIS IN ARCHAIC LITERATURE AND ART

The goddess Themis appears in literature long before we have more direct evidence for her cult. In Homer she is very much a personalised deity, described as “fair-cheeked” (καλλιπαρῆος, *Il.* 15.87) like any other female character, and shown sympathising with Hera when she has fallen out with Zeus (*Il.* 90-1). That Themis here is a fully-realised goddess is emphasised by Hera addressing her as θεὰ Θέμι (1.93), although her injunction to “rule over the gods in their house at the fairly divided feast” (1.95) does suggest that Themis represents the imposition of order in a social context.⁸ This is further apparent in her function as summoner of assemblies, both divine (*Il.* 20.4-6) and mortal, as when Telemachos appeals to the assembled Ithacans “in the name of Olympian Zeus and Themis, who both convenes and dismisses the assemblies

⁴ Farnell 1896-1909, III 13. Deubner (1902-9, 2069-70) leaves such figures as Themis and Hebe, “die eine volle persönliche Geltung erlangt haben”, out of his discussion of personifications, on the grounds that they need separate analysis.

⁵ Latte 1934, 1626-7.

⁶ Reinhardt 1966, 26: “Ist Themis eine uralte Erdgottheiten und zur ‘abstrakten’ Rechtsordnung erst nachträglich geworden? Oder hat man umgekehrt die Rechtsordnung nachträglich zum Rang einer Urgöttin erhoben?”

⁷ Bremmer (1994, 11), on the divine sense of justice in Homer: “Although gods did uphold the rules of justice, their obligations to kin and friends had priority. This attitude reflects the absence in Homeric society of a developed legal system, and it is only natural that in a more regulated period such a lack of a divine sense of justice came to be questioned.”

⁸ See Janko 1992, 238-9, ad 15.87-8. He notes Themis’ role in assemblies, and “An assembly is in fact called a *themis* (11.807). Her presence may also show that Right will now prevail on Olumpos.”

of men” (*Od.* 2.68-9). Both feasts and assemblies are of course highly structured and formal gatherings of men, where order and the observance of precedence are vital, any failure in such observance leading to quarrels and fighting.⁹ Hesiod places Themis in the generation of Rhea and Kronos, as one of the daughters of Earth and Heaven (*Theog.* 132-8), but he links her even more firmly to Zeus: “Next (after Metis) he married bright Themis, who bore the Seasons, Lawfulness, Justice and luxuriant Peace, who watch over the works of mortal men, and the Fates...”¹⁰ This makes explicit Themis’ association with law and order and reflects the very “morally correct” Zeus of the *Works and Days*, where he is again father of Dike (*Op.* 256) — in the absence of a developed political vocabulary, Hesiod articulates his concern with social justice through the medium of myth and personification.¹¹ Themis’ position as the genealogical link between Gaia and the Seasons also suggests that she has a role in assuring the order of the natural world. Themis makes a brief appearance in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (92-5), where she is one of the group of goddesses in attendance throughout Leto’s labour, and feeds the new-born Apollo nectar and ambrosia (124). The role of *kourotrophos* again suggests a connection with fertility, and the company Themis keeps here — Dione, Rhea, Ichnaia and Amphitrite — has also been described as a “groupe de déesses telluriques”, though Gaia herself is not mentioned.¹² In the *Homeric Hymn to Zeus*, Themis returns to a position as *paredros* and advisor to the king of the gods, who “conspires in close conversation with Themis, sitting inclined towards him” (23.2-3).¹³ Both this advisory capacity and Themis’ association with a just Zeus can be seen in the plot of the *Kypria*, as summarised by Proklos (*EGF* p.31, ll.5-6), where it is Themis who suggests the Trojan War to the

⁹ See Vos 1956, 42-7 on the Homeric goddess.

¹⁰ *Theog.* 901-4: δεύτερον ἡγάγετο λιπαρὴν Θέμιν, ἣ τέκεν Ὠρὰς, Εὐνομίην τε Δίκην τε καὶ Εἰρήνην τεθαλυῖαν, αἶ τ’ ἔργ’ ὠρεύουσι καταθνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι, Μοίρας θ’... See West 1966 *ad loc.* (pp.406-8); see below pp.194-201 on Eirene in literature.

¹¹ Murray paraphrases the Themis genealogy: “the relationship between divine order and human order produces the norms which establish good rule, justice and peace” (1993, 62). On Themis and a just Zeus, see Lloyd-Jones 1971.

¹² On this passage and its connection with ancient Delos, see Gallet de Santerre (1958, 149-51). For Ge Kourotrophos, see below on Athens.

¹³ Both the *Kypria* story and Themis’ “leaning” pose are nicely illustrated on a late-fifth century krater by the Kadmos Painter which conflates several episodes from the epic: the main scene is the Judgement of Paris, with Zeus, Eris and Themis watching the progress of their plans from above (c.410 BC, St. Petersburg 0.28/St. 1807; *ARV*² 1185,7; Shapiro 1993, no.15, figs. 14 and 184). Cf. the Berlin amphoriskos discussed below (pp.107-8) for suitable personifications watching from the sidelines. See Vos 1956, 53-6 on Themis as Zeus’ advisor.

king of the gods as a means of punishing the corruption of mankind and reducing the earth's over-population.¹⁴

In later literature the abstract θέμις tends to be replaced by δίκη,¹⁵ and the same trend can be seen with the goddesses — it is usually Dike rather than Themis who features in extant archaic lyric poetry¹⁶ — but Hesiod's allegorical linking of the two is taken up in the first half of the fifth century by Bakchylides and Pindar. In the dithyramb entitled “The request for the return of Helen”, Bakchylides' Menelaos appeals to the Trojans' sense of fairness: “but it is established amongst all men to meet with straight-forward Justice, attendant of sacred Lawfulness and wise Themis; the children of the blessed choose her to share their home.”¹⁷ In *Olympian* 13, Pindar attributes Corinth's prosperity to the city's law and order: “in her dwell Lawfulness and her sisters, firm foundation of cities, Justice and Peace, who is reared with her, guardians of wealth for men, golden children of wise-counselling Themis...”¹⁸ Elsewhere Pindar completes the Hesiodic genealogy by referring to Themis as wife of Zeus and mother of the Seasons (fr. 30 SM), although she resumes her Homeric place as adviser to the Olympians in *Isthmian* 8 (30-45), where she warns Zeus and Poseidon against pursuing Thetis, who is fated to bear a son stronger than his father.¹⁹

In the visual arts of the archaic period Themis appears only rarely. We hear of a chryselephantine statue of Themis by the mid-sixth century sculptor Dorykleidas in the temple of Hera at Olympia; Pausanias picks up the Hesiodic genealogy in his account, describing Dorykleidas' Themis as “mother of the Seasons”, since she is

¹⁴ See further below (pp.96-9) on the *Kypria* and Rhamnous.

¹⁵ Vos 1956, 32-5.

¹⁶ E.g. Solon fr. 4 West, 12-16.

¹⁷ Fr. 15 Maehler, 53-6: ἀλλ' ἐν [μέσ]ωι κεῖται κιχεῖν/ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις Δίκαν ἰθεῖαν, ἀγνῶς/ Εὐνομίας ἀκόλουθον καὶ πινυτᾶς Θέμιτος/ ὀλβίων π[αῖδές] νιν αἰρεῦνται σύνοικον. The speech goes on to contrast Dike with Hybris, the latter bringing her adherents to ruin, in the same way as she destroyed the arrogant Giants. The opposition set up in the passage places Themis with Dike against the Giants, “arrogant sons of Ge” (62-3); Themis is explicitly opposed to the Giants on the Siphnian Treasury frieze (see below). Presumably such a rational polarisation has no room for Themis as an aspect of Ge. Defradas comments on the genealogy in *Prometheus Bound*, which makes Ge/Themis mother of Prometheus, that “Right” seems to have changed sides (1958, 204). Cf. Bakchylides fr. 13 Maehler, 182-9, for Eukleia and Eunomia welcoming the victor Pytheas home to peaceful Aigina (485/3 BC).

¹⁸ O. 13. 6-8: ἐν τᾷ γὰρ Εὐνομία ναίει κασιγνήτα τε, βάθρον πολίων ἀσφαλές,/ Δίκα καὶ ὁμότροφος Εἰρήνη, ταμίαι ἀνδράσι πλούτου,/ χρύσειαι παῖδες εὐβούλου Θέμιτος...

¹⁹ On this passage, see Slatkin 1991, 70-3. On Themis and the Trojan War, see further below pp.98-9. An association with Zeus can perhaps also be seen in a brief reference to a Themis Hikesia, Aisch. *Suppl.* 360 (see below p.219, n.52).

standing beside a group of seated Horai.²⁰ She is among the many deities who attend the wedding of Peleus and Thetis on the well-known Sophilos dinos of around 580 BC (FIG. 1),²¹ where the sceptre she carries may be a reference to her Homeric connection with the assembly.²² Such a collectivity of Olympian gods is also the context for Themis' appearance on the north frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi, where she takes part in the Gigantomachy, c.530-25 BC (FIG. 2).²³ Before the discovery of the inscription naming her as Themis, the figure in the lion-drawn chariot had usually been assumed to be Kybele, in her aspect as Mistress of Animals, because of the lions and the animal skin she is wearing over her chiton. But the inscriptions suggest that the lions belong to Dionysos, who has dismounted to fight, to the left, while Themis is acting as his charioteer.²⁴

CULTS OF THEMIS

The literary and iconographic record, then, presents the archaic Themis as a subsidiary character but with a firmly established position amongst the Olympian gods. More direct evidence for specific local cults of Themis is widely scattered, from Macedonia to the Argolid, but most of our information comes from inscriptions dating no earlier than the fourth century, or from Pausanias. This has not, however, prevented a number of scholars from arguing for an archaic cult in several locations. Vos, for example, sees Themis' cult as originating in Thessaly, where it is "alt und ursprünglich", moving south through Boiotia to reach Attica by the early fifth

²⁰ Paus. 5.17.1-3. For Dorykleidas' birth-date in about the 50th Olympiad (580-76 BC), see Pliny *NH* 36.9.

²¹ London BM 1971.11-1.1; *Para.* 19, 16 *bis*, *Add.*² 10-11; Shapiro 1993, no.141 fig.179.

²² E.g. Achilles swears on the sceptre which "the sons of the Achaians/ carry in their hands when, administering justice (δικασπόλοι), they honour the ordinances (θέμιστας) of Zeus" (*Il.* 1.237-9). See van Wees 1992, 276-80 on the functions of the Homeric sceptre. Some sort of related ritual role in politics seems to be being played by Themis on a red-figure kalyx-krater signed by Syriskos, c.470 BC, where she stands between two sceptre-holding kings, Balos and Epaphos. Themis holds out a phiale in her right hand, a lekythos in her left, which Shapiro tentatively interprets as "preparing to pour a libation". Shapiro 1993, 219, no.145 fig.181, Malibu 92.AE.6 (unpublished).

²³ Identified by Brinkmann 1985: Dionysos inscription = N 16, figs. 63-4; Themis inscription = N 17 figs. 65-6; see fig. 93 for reconstruction of whole west and north friezes complete with inscriptions, and 121-30 on their interpretation. Shapiro 1993 no. 143 fig. 180; Schefold 1992, fig. 67. Themis is again included in the Gigantomachy on the south frieze of the altar of Zeus at Pergamon (Pollitt 1986, 97-110, fig.98).

²⁴ Schefold (1992, 59-62) explains Themis here as "in the guise" of Kybele.

century;²⁵ Hamdorf is more cautious, though he would allow a sixth century date for the cult in Thessaly and perhaps Olympia;²⁶ Shapiro takes only the cult at Troizen to be archaic.²⁷ It is perhaps worth briefly reviewing the evidence upon which these hypotheses are based before turning to the more substantial cases of Delphi, Rhamnous and Athens.

The case for an early Themis cult in Thessaly rests largely on the appearance of Θεμιστίος as a month-name in a number of towns, mostly attested by inscriptions recording manumissions. One such list from Metropolis provides us with four local month-names, *Thuos*, *Hermaios*, *Itonios* and *Themistios*,²⁸ while the more recently discovered manumission list from Skotussa gives further names and some indication of their order.²⁹ That the name is peculiarly Thessalian is suggested by an arbitration record from Kerkyra, dated to 182 BC, which refers to “the month Themistios, as the Thessalians (call it)”.³⁰ None of these is dated before the second century BC, but such month-names are generally held to be of some antiquity, and related to festivals celebrated therein.³¹ Given the difficulties of interpretation presented by even the Attic calendar, about which we are relatively well informed, the Thessalian Themistios can only cautiously be taken as evidence for the early worship of Themis, but the possibility is there.³² Further evidence of Themis’ important position in the Thessalian pantheon is, however, provided by the unusual altar from Pherai dedicated to six goddesses.³³ Block A has five pointed half-stelai in relief, each with three inscribed names, the upper two partly erased (the names of line 2 written retrograde):

²⁵ Vos 1956, 68-78. He is writing before the current programme of excavations at Rhamnous began, on which see below.

²⁶ Hamdorf 1964, 50-1, 57. Olympia: below n.62.

²⁷ Shapiro (1993, 217 and n.503). Corsano’s chapter on Themis’ cult (1988, 97-108) sensibly concentrates on data relating to the fifth century and later; she points out the paradox that all our data concerning the goddess date from a period when the system of oral justice, which she takes Themis to represent, had lost its influence (6-7).

²⁸ IG IX.2, 277; see Monceaux 1883, 52-6. Hamdorf 1964, 109 T 411 refers to SGD/ 386 for an archaic (?) dedicatory inscription from Metropolis, but this seems to be an error.

²⁹ SEG XV (1958) 370. Eg b.11-12: Θεμιστίου δευτέραι Δημήτριος ἀπὸ Ὀνάσου τοῦ Ποσειδίππου... and 52-3: Ἀρέθουσσα ἀπὸ Ἀρχεπόλεως τοῦ Πολυξένου Θεμιστίου ἑβδόμη.

³⁰ IG IX.1, 689, 3-4: : μηνὸς/ [ὡς Θε]σσαλοὶ ἄγοντι Θεμιστίου. Cf. IG IX.2, 256b.1 from nearby Pharsalos (Roman imperial period): στρατηγοῦντος Φ<λα>βίου Πολυκρίτου τὸ β’ μηνὸς Θεμιστίους...

³¹ Burkert (1985, 227) argues that in general month names must go back to at least the Proto-Geometric period, but points out that later changes “must always be reckoned with”.

³² On problems with the Athenian calendar, and scholarly blindness thereto, see Pritchett 1979, 163-8.

³³ Discussed in detail by Miller 1974.

Hestia	Demeter	Enodia	Aphrodite	Athena	Themis
Themis	Aphrodite	Athena	Enodia	Demeter	Hestia
Themis	Aphrodite	Athena	Enodia	Demeter	Hestia

This may have been part of a larger construction, or half of a pair of monuments, honouring the Twelve Gods, with images of the goddesses resting above the inscribed block.³⁴ A mid fourth-century date is suggested by the type of hook clamps and letter forms used, with subsequent damage and repair no later than the early third century. While Hestia, Demeter, Aphrodite and Athena are quite regular members of the set of six major Olympian goddesses, Enodia and Themis seem to be peculiar to Thessaly.³⁵ Miller sees Enodia as fairly straightforwardly taking the place of Artemis, since both are associated with Hekate, and there is plenty of archaeological and iconographic evidence for Enodia's cult in Thessaly, which seems to have been observed at Pherai from at least the eighth century before becoming more widespread.³⁶ The case for Themis as replacement for Hera is perhaps less obvious, but, as Miller points out, both are consorts of Zeus, and such a substitution would go some way towards explaining the lack of evidence for Hera's cult in Thessaly before the Roman period. In addition to the month-name Themistios, a number of personal names derived from Themis may also suggest that the goddess was important in the region: Pasithemis, Themistion, Themison, Themistokles and Themistogenes are all attested in Thessalian inscriptions, though most are Hellenistic in date.³⁷ Actual dedications to Themis in Thessaly are in short supply, and only one has any claim to be archaic. This is from Phalanna, recording a dedication by Orestaia to *Themissta*, its tentative dating resting on the archaic forms of the letters α and θ, though this need not make it any earlier than the first quarter of the fifth century.³⁸ That at least one Thessalian sanctuary of Themis

³⁴ See Miller 1974 fig.4 for a reconstruction. Cf. Long 1987 on representations of the Twelve Gods in general, and s.v. Pherai 1 (p.30 and 205-6) for this altar, illustrated at fig. 75.

³⁵ Cf. below p.223-4 and 228-9 on the Athenian Twelve Gods.

³⁶ Miller 1974, 250-2. On the Thessalian Enodia, and her chthonic connections with Hekate, see Chrysostomou 1994. See Morgan (1997, 170-5) on cult activity at Pherai in the Early Iron Age and archaic period.

³⁷ Miller 1974, 252-5. Various Themis-related names are also attested on Cyprus (cf. SEG 30.1608 for a Cypriot dedication to Themis from the Cave of the Nymph) and several Aegean islands (LGPN I, pp.211-12), and future volumes of LGPN will doubtless provide more material for pursuing this line of enquiry. See below on Athenian names, and Parker 1998 on theophoric names and their relation to cult practice in general.

³⁸ IG IX.2, 1236, 99: ... Ὀρεσταίῃα ὀνέθηκε τῇ Θεμίσση. No date is volunteered in IG IX, or in the original publication (Lolling, AM 7, 1882, 223 no.1), but see Jeffery 1990, 96-9 on archaic Thessalian script, and cf. pl.11 nos.4 and 7 for examples of the same forms of θ and α dating to 475-50 BC.

had sufficient funds to require public management in the second century BC, however, is attested by a lead tablet from Dodona recording an enquiry of the oracle of Zeus by the people of Mondaia:

Of Zeus Naios and Dione the state of the Mondaiatai enquires concerning the money of Themis if it is permissible and better to lend it out for Themis.³⁹

Also in Thessaly, according to Strabo, in the region of Thessaliotis, is “Ichnai, where Ichnaian Themis is honoured” (9.5.14), though other sources locate the town in Macedonia. Herodotos places it near Pella, Hesychios speaks of an oracle of Apollo at Macedonian Ichnai, where “Ichnaian Themis is honoured”, and Stephanus Byzantius explains the topographical epithet as acquired when Themis was pursued by Zeus, since she was overtaken at Ichnai.⁴⁰ Farnell’s comment “We must suppose that the people imagined him pursuing a real corporeal goddess, and not the abstract idea of righteousness” is pithy, but it seems quite possible that the grammarian is conflating Themis here with Nemesis, the story of whose pursuit and rape is rather better known.⁴¹ Our only possible material evidence for Themis in Macedonia is a black-glaze skyphos of the mid-fifth century with the inscription *Themidos* under the foot, though a cup “of/belonging to O/order” need not necessarily relate to a cult of the personification.⁴²

For Boiotia our only datable testimonium is a fourth century inscription from Thespiiai naming Alexis, daughter of Xenophilos, as a priestess of Themis.⁴³ Pausanias mentions a temple of Themis at Tanagra, near the theatre and sanctuary of Dionysos

³⁹ *SGDI* 1557: Δὲ Λάωι καὶ Διώναι/ ἐπικοινᾶτα Μον[δ]αιατᾶν τὸ κοινὸν πὲρ το(ῦ) [ἄρ]/γύρροι τᾶς Θέμιστο(ς), αἱ ἄ(ν)εκ[τ]ό[ν] ἐστι/ τα Θέμι/(σ)τι καὶ βέλτιον ἐ(σ)κιχρέμεν. Cf. *IG* IX.2, 276a, 5 for the month-name Themistios at Mondaia. Themis appears again in Epiros in the *Suda*’s interesting etymology for the town of Boucheta (s.v. βούχετα): πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Ἡπείρου, ἣν φησι Φιλόχορος ὠνομάσθαι διὰ τὸ τὴν Θέμιν ἐπὶ βοὸς ὀχουμένην ἐλθεῖν ἐκεῖ κατὰ τὸν Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμόν.

⁴⁰ *Hdt* 7.123. Hesych. s.v. Ἰχναίην χώραν· τὴν Μακεδονίαν, ἐνθα τὸ μαντεῖον ὁ Ἀπόλλων κατέσχε, καὶ τιμᾶται Ἰχναίη Θέμις. Farnell (1902-9, III 14) makes the rather baseless suggestion that Themis Ichnaia was perhaps the original occupier of this oracle, presumably by analogy with Delphi (see below). Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἰχναί: Ἰχναί, πόλις Μακεδονίας... τὸ ἔθνικόν καὶ Ἰχναῖος καὶ Ἰχναία ἢ Θέμις. διωκομένη γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς, κατελείφθη ἐν τοῖς τῶν Ἰχναίων τόποις. καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ διωχθῆναι κατ’ ἶχνος ὠνομάσθη. Alternative explanations of the title point to its literal meaning “Tracker” (Gantz 1993, 52), though this may be a late rationalisation.

⁴¹ Farnell 1902-9, III 14. Cf. *AP* 9.405 for an *ichnaiê* Nemesis, appealed to alongside Adrasteia. See below pp.96-8 on Nemesis’ rape. See *Hom. Hymn to Apollo* 1.94(above) for Ichnaia as apparently a separate deity, though next to Themis.

⁴² Shapiro 1993, 219 n.507.

⁴³ *IG* VII 1816: Ἀλεξις Ξενοφίλω/ ιαρειάξασα Θέμιτι. On Boiotian Themis, see Schachter 1994, 50-2.

(9.22.1), and a sanctuary of Themis with “a white stone statue” at Thebes, near sanctuaries of the Moirai and Zeus Agoraios (9.25.4). Themis’ proximity to Zeus Agoraios may be fortuitous here, but on Rhodes an association with the market-place can be seen in a fourth century inscription on a statue base from Lindos, dedicated by Erasmios after being in office as *agoranomos* “to Zeus Agoraios, the Themides and Hermes”.⁴⁴ Such an association, recalling Themis’ Homeric role, is assumed by Hesychios’ entry for “Themis Agoraia: of the Assembly”.⁴⁵ Plural Themides are also attested by Pausanias at Troizen in the Argolid, where an altar “they say” was dedicated by the mythical king Pittheus (2.31.8). Shapiro asserts that the plurality indicates the cult’s antiquity, as it “is a frequent feature of Archaic religion”, rejecting Hamdorf’s suggestion that it reflects “die Vielseitigkeit des Begriffs”.⁴⁶ I would argue that an ability to multiply is rather a feature of personifications, facilitated by their relative lack of individual characterisation, and not confined to the archaic period; I shall return to the question in connection with Nemesis.⁴⁷

So far, then, a case for an early cult of Themis can only really be made for Thessaly, and even here we have no firm evidence before the fifth century; Themis’ supposed association with Ge has yet to be seen. Three locations remain to be investigated: an archaic Themis is often posited for the Panhellenic sanctuary of Delphi, where, with Gaia, she is one of the mythical “previous owners” of the oracle; Themis seems to have shared Nemesis’ sanctuary at Rhamnous, where there are traces of cult activity from the early sixth century; Athens is the only place where Themis is actually attested as an epithet of Ge.

⁴⁴ *ASAtene* n.s. 17-18 (1955-6), 170 no.21, fig. 21: Ἐράσμιος Ἐρασιμίου/ τοῦ Κρίνιος/ ἀγορανομήσας/ Διὶ Ἀγοραίῳ καὶ Θέμισι/ καὶ Ἑρμῇ. Some idea of fair trading may also inform two references in Pindar which associate Themis closely with Zeus Xenios: in the context of religious celebrations on Tenedos “Themis is honoured at the never-ending feasts of Zeus, god of hospitality” (*N.* 11.8-9), and again on Aigina “saviour Themis, enthroned beside Zeus Xenios, is honoured more than among all other men” (*O.* 8.21-3). The context of the Aigina quote indicates that Themis here represents straight dealing in commerce, and Pindar praises the just dealings of the Aiginetans elsewhere (*N.* 4.12, *P.* 8.22, etc.), but I would not take this as positive proof of an Aiginetan cult of Themis (*contra* Shapiro 219, n.507).

⁴⁵ Hesych. s.v. Ἀγοραία Θέμις· ἡ ἐκκλησιαστική.

⁴⁶ Shapiro 1993, 217 and n. 503; Hamdorf 1964, 51. See Price 1971.

⁴⁷ See below pp.116-18 on the two Nemeseis of Smyrna.

DELPHI, THEMIS AND ORACLES

*Cur Themis oraculis praesit: ... Themida nostram nihil aliud quam legem esse divinam ab ipso summo promanantem bono, naturaeque universitatis ita praescriptam, ut sine hac consistere nequeat. Igitur et oraculorum divinationisque fontem purum continere arbitrantur Platonici...*⁴⁸

The myth which associates both Themis and Gaia with Delphi as “previous owners” of the oracle, before the arrival of Apollo, is first attested by the prologue to Aeschylus’ *Eumenides*, produced in 458 BC, which opens at Delphi, with the Pythia praying: “First of the gods I honour in my prayer is Earth, the first prophet; after her, Themis, who was second to hold her mother’s oracular seat, as the story goes...”⁴⁹ Themis willingly handed the oracle on to the Titan Phoibe, who in turn gave it to Phoibos Apollo as a present on his birth.⁵⁰ Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood has convincingly demonstrated that this myth cannot be taken to reflect any real cultic history of the oracle, but rather expresses certain perceptions about it, of the fifth century and later, especially its civilising, order-creating function.⁵¹ Examining the case for any historical predecessors of Apollo at Delphi, she points out that even were there to have been a Mycenaean cult of Gaia there, as has sometimes been posited, but which is far from certain, the absence of any evidence of continuity in cult activity between the Mycenaean period and the late ninth century argues against connecting the hypothetical Mycenaean shrine with the previous owners myth.⁵² Since the Apolline oracle is referred to in Homer (e.g. *Od.* 8.79-81), it must have been well established by

⁴⁸ Pighius 1568, 82.

⁴⁹ *Eum.* 1-4: πρῶτον μὲν εὐχῇ τῇδε πρεσβεύω θεῶν/ τὴν πρωτόμαντιν Γαῖαν· ἐκ δὲ τῆς Θέμιν, ἣ δὴ το μητρὸς δευτέρα τόδ’ ἔξετο/ μαντεῖον, ὥς λόγος τις...

⁵⁰ Elsewhere the transfer of the oracle is violent, e.g. Pindar fr. 55, Eur. *IT* 1242-82. Commenting on the *Eumenides* passage, Shapiro (1993, 221) says: “Later in the play, however, Aeschylus takes liberties with this same genealogy, when he speaks of Themis and Gaia as two names for same goddess (211-12).” Presumably he is confusing the *Eumenides* with the *Prometheus*, on which see below. Gantz (1993, 88) points out that peaceful transfer of power from female to male is a very appropriate prologue for the story of the *Eumenides*, so “we should probably suspect Aeschylean invention here”.

⁵¹ Sourvinou-Inwood 1987; see 235 n.1 for sources for the myth, n.2 for modern believers in Gaia and/or Themis as oracular divinities at Delphi. For a reading of the previous owners myth as a way of “neutralising the feminine”, see Loraux 1995, 183-93. On a more practical level, the myth reflects the competitive nature of sanctuaries (Marinatos 1993), helping “to establish the oracle’s antiquity, and therefore superiority, in relation to its rivals” (Morgan 1993, 36). On early Delphi and divination see Morgan 1990, 148-90.

⁵² The Mycenaean female figurines found in the archaic sanctuary of Athena Pronaia do not show the identity of the deity worshipped, and Gaia is not attested in the Mycenaean pantheon. On the early history of the sanctuary at Delphi and lack of material evidence before c.800 BC, see Morgan 1990, 126-47.

the eighth century, i.e. soon after the beginning of cultic activity in the sanctuary, which leaves little room for a previous cult of Gaia or Themis.⁵³

Leaving aside the myth, then, what positive evidence is there for the presence of Gaia/Themis at Delphi? Themis' unusual inclusion on the frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi (above) *could* be explained as a reference to a local cult, but is certainly not evidence of such by itself; at a symbolic level her presence can perhaps be explained as an indication of the scene's message, the victory of order over chaos.⁵⁴ If anything, the frieze counts against an archaic association of Themis and Gaia, since they should be fighting on opposite sides, Earth supporting her sons the Giants.⁵⁵ The earliest literary evidence for worship of Themis at Delphi comes in an ode of Pindar, of 474 BC, where the victor's compatriots are exhorted to come "... where when night falls you shall hymn sacred Themis and Pytho and the right-judging navel of the earth..."⁵⁶ Also from the first half of the fifth century are a pair of statue bases found near the Kastalian Spring, inscribed with the names Themis and Ga respectively, by the same hand;⁵⁷ cuttings on the bases suggest that they stood next to one another, with a bronze laurel tree between them.⁵⁸ We have little further information on Themis, but from a fourth century inscription and Plutarch's description we know that Gaia had a shrine south of the temple of Apollo.⁵⁹

Our earliest evidence for the Previous Owners myth and for the historical worship of Themis and Gaia at Delphi, then, dates from the first half of the fifth

⁵³ No link can be made between Delphi and the Themis of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, as the passage occurs in the Delian part of the hymn. Indeed, the Pythian part contradicts the previous owners myth, presenting Apollo as founder of the oracle, as does Alkaios' *Hymn to Apollo* (Sourvinou-Inwood 1987, 216-7 and nn.7-8).

⁵⁴ So e.g. Shapiro (1993, 219) explains the link between Dionysos and Themis on the frieze as "Delphi itself". See Burkert 1985a, 224 on the tradition of Dionysos' presence at Delphi. Such use of a personification as an explanatory "label" could be paralleled by the personified rivers and places who indicate geographical setting, though not at such an early date. The Gigantomachy myth also appears on the west pediment of the temple of Apollo at Delphi.

⁵⁵ See above, n.17.

⁵⁶ P. 11.9-10: ὄφρα θέμιν ἱερὰν Πυθῶνά τε καὶ ὀρθοδίκαν/ γὰρ ὁμφαλὸν κελαδήσει ἄκρα σὺν ἐσπέρα.... *Hieros* is not usually used of divinities in Greek literature, so Vos (1956, 62-3) follows Wilamowitz in making Themis here impersonal, "holy righteousness"; but given the idea of praise, the abstract is very difficult to justify. Defradas (1958, 205) compromises by understanding Themis as an "allegorical goddess", the epithet *hieros* indeed signifying that Right is deified here, but only as a poetic conceit.

⁵⁷ Delphi inv. 4286; Courby 1927, 163-4 fig. 126; Shapiro 1993 no.144. Shapiro (1993, 221) rather simplistically takes these as assuring "that the Aeschylean genealogy of the Delphic oracle is not a poetic fabrication".

⁵⁸ According to Coste-Messelière and Flacelière 1930, 289 and 294. Sourvinou-Inwood (1987, 221) suggests that these can be seen as a response to the myth.

⁵⁹ Plut. *Pyth. Orac.* 402c-d. Sourvinou-Inwood 1987, 221 and n.29.

century. If there was no historical tradition for the myth to be based upon, how did it arise and gain currency? The answer surely lies in the conceptual links which both Gaia and Themis have with the oracle, vague associations which the myth systematises.⁶⁰ The omphalos in Apollo's adyton symbolised Delphi's position as the centre of the earth, the meeting point of the mythical eagles of Zeus sent from furthest east and west (Pindar fr.54 SM), but the term "navel" inevitably suggests Earth in anthropomorphic form.⁶¹ According to Pausanias, Earth also had an oracle at Olympia, possibly again linked with a cult of Themis,⁶² and oracular powers are often associated with chthonic cults,⁶³ so the idea of an Earth oracle at Delphi would be in keeping with Gaia's cult in general. Themis' association with the oracle is most straightforwardly explained by the usage of the plural θέμιστες for "oracles" and θεμιστεύειν "to give an oracle", from Homer onwards.⁶⁴ The oracle's role as adviser to individuals and states is paralleled by Themis' role as adviser to Zeus, and the goddess is explicitly represented as Delphic adviser in the tondo of the Codrus Painter's cup in Berlin, 440-30 BC (FIG. 3).⁶⁵ The Athenian king Aigeus stands in a temple, indicated by the

⁶⁰ Sourvinou-Inwood (1987, 228) suggests that Themis "was a symbolically mediating figure between Apollo and Gaia", providing a "halfway house" between the primordial, chthonic goddess Gaia and the Olympian Apollo, since she is associated with Zeus' order and justice, but is nevertheless female.

⁶¹ The stone may be considerably older than this interpretation of it. See Sourvinou-Inwood (1987, 225 and n.47) on a type of oval stone in Minoan iconography associated with young male gods, and 233-5.

⁶² Pausanias records an altar of Ge, where "they say" there had "in even more ancient times" been an oracle of Earth; immediately after this he tells us that "the altar of Themis is built at what they call the Mouth (Στόμιον)" (5.14.10). Whether the two were located together is unfortunately not clear, as this falls in his section on "all the altars at Olympia" (5.14.4ff), where Pausanias has departed from his usual practice of describing things in the order he found them: "my description has wandered around in the order in which the Eleians sacrifice" (5.14.10). Valk (1959, 147) cites this as of especial interest in support of the Themis as earth-goddess idea: Vos 68ff. "has not proved beyond doubt that this theory is incorrect", although he has shown that cults of Themis are often not of great antiquity. On the case for early cults of Gaia and Themis at Olympia and Delphi, see Morgan 1990, 42-3 and nn.51-2.

⁶³ Cf. the Oracle of the Dead at Ephrya and that of Trophonios at Lebadeia. Teutonic mythology also has a prophetic earth-goddess, Erda, who appears in Wagner's *Ring* as adviser to Wotan: "Wie alles war, weiss ich;/ wie alles wird, wie alles sein wird,/ seh' ich auch..." (*Das Rheingold*, scene 4).

⁶⁴ Vos suggests that θέμιστες should be translated as "decisions" of the gods, manifestations of the authority which is their privilege, rather than "oracles" (1957, 17-22). Valk (1959, 145) elaborates this to "the instituted and unalterable order of existing things".

⁶⁵ Berlin F2538; ARV² 1269,5 and 1689; Shapiro 1993, no.146 fig.182. See LIMC I, 359, s.v. Aigeus, for myth and sources. The version of the Aigeus myth in Euripides' *Medea*, more or less contemporary with the vase, makes use of the word θέμις in the context of the oracle: Medea asks "Is it *themis* for me to hear what the oracle said?" 676-8. In Eur. *Or.* 163-5 Elektra refers to the Delphic tripod as that of Themis, making an ironic oxymoron with the, in her view, *adikos* Apollo. Shapiro suggests that perhaps "the frequent use of *themis* with

column and entablature, opposite a female figure, in the guise of a priestess, sitting on a tripod and holding a laurel branch and a phiale in her hands. Iconographically, she is clearly the Pythia, but an inscription identifies her as Themis, the personification of the Pythia's utterances.⁶⁶ Such a Delphic Themis is perhaps also evident in the Tübingen red-figure skyphos of 430-25 BC, on which Themis is shown carrying a torch and a *kanoun*, apparently welcoming the newly arrived huntress-goddess Bendis to Athens; a plausible interpretation is that Themis is here fulfilling Delphi's traditional role of sanctioning the establishment of a new cult (FIG. 4).⁶⁷ An explicit association between Delphi and the "wise-counselling" Themis of archaic poetry is made in the scene depicted on a fourth-century pelike by the Eleusinian Painter from Kertsch, where Themis is advising Zeus (perhaps suggesting the Trojan War plan to him?) seated on the omphalos (FIG. 5).⁶⁸

THEMIS AT RHAMNOUS

At Delphi, then, both Themis and Gaia are associated with the oracle, the common link strengthening their Hesiodic connection with each other, but not before the fifth century. At Rhamnous a rather different history can be traced, with Themis apparently developing as an associate of Nemesis rather than of Gaia. As it stands today, the sanctuary is dominated by the remains of two buildings standing close together: a Doric peripteral temple of around 430 BC, identified as that of Nemesis, and a smaller structure consisting of simply a *cella* and porch (FIGS. 6-7a). The site was first excavated by the Society of Dilettanti in the early nineteenth century, and further investigations were carried out in the late nineteenth century by Staïs, but the site was then left undisturbed until the current excavation programme was begun twenty years ago, which continues under the direction of Vasileos Petrakos. The fortress of Rhamnous was studied in detail in 1947-50 by Pouilloux, and Petrakos' investigations have added more information about the fortress and the tomb-lined

reference to divine law and divine pronouncements eventually gave rise to the idea that the goddess" had once lived at Delphi (Shapiro 1993, 223).

⁶⁶ On the role of the Pythia in divinatory procedure at Delphi, see most recently Maurizio 1995.

⁶⁷ Tübingen F2; *ARV*² 1023; *CVA* Tübingen 5 (1986), 49-52 (including a summary of previous discussions); Shapiro 1993, 223-6, no.147 fig. 185. Roller includes this in her brief survey of the depiction of foreign cults in Attic vase-painting (1988, 511-12, fig. 3). See Parker 1985, 305 on the legitimising role of oracles in relation to cult practice.

⁶⁸ St. Petersburg, c.340 BC; *ARV*² 1476, 2; Shapiro 1993, 223 fig.183.

Sacred Way which links it to the sanctuary, as well as the sanctuary buildings themselves.⁶⁹ The extended fortifications were not completed until the second half of the fourth century or even the early third; the earlier citadel must have been in existence by 412, but how much was in place before the mid-fifth century is a matter of some debate.⁷⁰ The fullest literary account we have of Rhamnous is Pausanias' description, which locates the village "seven and a half miles from Marathon... by the sea", but thereafter concentrates almost exclusively on Agorakritos' famous cult statue of Nemesis. The village was just south-east of the fortress, beside the eastern harbour, though little remains to be seen; the Sacred Way continues to the south of the sanctuary, linking it to the neighbouring deme of Trikorynthos.⁷¹

The smaller structure (FIG. 7b) seems to have been built on a virgin site, but the date of its foundation has not been established more exactly than "early fifth century", or "the beginning of the fifth century".⁷² Two inscriptions found inside the building name priestesses of Themis, the earlier being one of a pair of thrones dedicated by one Sostratos in the second half of the fourth century:

- a) In the priestesshood of Philostratê. b) In the priestesshood of Kallistô.
 Sôstratos dedicated this to Themis. Sôstratos dedicated this to Nemesis.⁷³

The second inscription, of the end of the fourth or early third century, is from the base of the much-discussed statue of Themis (FIG. 8), naming the dedicator and sculptor as well as two priestesses:

⁶⁹ Pouilloux 1954. For a brief history of the excavations, see Miles 1989, 137-40 (the Society of Dilettanti had intended to travel to Asia Minor, but were put off by rumours of piracy, so they had to find something to do in Attika!). For general accounts of the site see Petrakos 1987 and 1991; also Travlos 1988, 388-400. Miles 1989 discusses the temple of Nemesis in detail (see below p.100-1 and 106-7).

⁷⁰ Pouilloux (1954, 43-66) discusses problems of dating the ramparts at length, concluding that any sixth-century occupation seems unlikely; he notes (56-7) the absence of any mention of Rhamnous as a point of defence in Herodotos' account of the combined Spartan-Boiotian attack of 507/6 (5.74). Recent excavations in the fortress, however, have uncovered some inscriptions of the sixth century: AR 1990-1 and 1991-2.

⁷¹ Paus. 1.33.2 ff.; Pouilloux 1954, 16; on the bias of visitors ancient and modern, see *ibid.* 9-13.

⁷² *Blue Guide to Greece* (1990), 240; Petrakos 1991, 20. Other offers: "archaic", Miles 1989, 139; "post-Persian War", AR 1985-6, 17; "nach der Schlacht von Marathon", Travlos 1988, 388. The stem of an Attic black-figure kylix found beneath the southernmost of three statue bases in the SW corner of the shrine provides a *terminus post quem* of "the beginning of the fifth century" for the statues (Petrakos 1984, 143 no. 576). For a detailed discussion of the smaller temple see Petrakos 1984, 142-53.

⁷³ *JG II*² 4638 (Pouilloux 1954, no.40): (a) ἐπὶ ἱερείας Φιλοστρά[της] Θέμιδι / Σώστρατος / ἀνέθηκεν. (b) ἐπὶ ἱερείας Καλλιστο[ύς] Νεμέσει / Σώστρατος / ἀνέθηκεν.

Megakles son of Megakles the Rhamnousian dedicated me to Themis, having being crowned by the people because of his justice, in the priestesshood of Kallistô, and of Pheidostrate, priestess of Nemesis, having been victorious in both the boys' and the men's [athletic competitions], while *gymnasiarch* and *choregos* for the comedies. Chairestratos, son of Chairedemos, the Rhamnousian made this.⁷⁴

These inscriptions give clear evidence of two separate offices for priestesses of Nemesis and of Themis, and the phrase ἐπὶ ἱερείας [*woman's name*], which appears in both, sounds like a dating formula, suggesting that great importance was attached to the position.⁷⁵ The statue cannot of course have been the cult image, since it is a private dedication, but the inscription certainly implies that it should be identified as Themis.⁷⁶ Two goddesses were certainly worshipped at the sanctuary, then, although straightforward interpretation of the smaller building as Themis' temple is obfuscated by its apparent use as a storehouse, at least in later stages.⁷⁷ How early the cults of each of the two goddesses were established, however, remains open to question. The Nemesis temple of c.430 was preceded by two successive structures of the sixth century, material from which was used to fill the artificial terrace upon which the extant temples stand. All that survives from the early sixth-century building are some Lakonian roofiles and a terracotta sphinx head, but the construction dating from the end of the century was a Doric temple, with a *distyle in antis* façade, which Petrakos suggests was probably destroyed by the Persians in 480-79 BC and left in ruins until the current temple was built.⁷⁸ The extreme proximity and lack of alignment of the Themis structure with the Classical temple of Nemesis is presumably to be explained by the fact that the former would have been built in relation to this archaic temple,

⁷⁴ Statue: Athens NM 231. Inscription *IG II² 3109* (Pouilloux 1954, no.39): Μεγακλῆς Μεγακλέου[ς] Ῥαμνούσι[ος] ἀνέθηκεν Θέμιδι στεφανωθείς ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν δικαιοσύνης ἕνεκα ἐπὶ ἱερείας Καλλιστοῦς / καὶ Φειδοστράτης Νεμέσει ἱερείας / καὶ νικήσας παισὶ καὶ ἀνδράσι γυμνασιαρχῶν / καὶ κωμικοῖς χορηγῶν. / Χαιρέστρατος Χαιρεδήμου / Ῥαμν<ο>ύσι<ο>ς ἐπ<ό>ησε.

⁷⁵ See Wilhelm 1940 for an analysis of the two inscriptions, alongside that on the base of a statue of Aristonoe, priestess of Nemesis at the end of the third century (*IG II² 3462*; Pouilloux 1954, no.44).

⁷⁶ Palagia's argument against the identification seems unnecessarily complicated (1994, 118-19). The inscription makes the statue one of the relatively few fixed points in the chronology of Hellenistic sculpture; see Pollitt 1986, 265-8. See Harrison 1977 on the relationship of this to other representations of Themis.

⁷⁷ Petrakos 1991, 23; he is perhaps over-cautious in commenting that, although Themis was worshipped in the sanctuary, "her presence there cannot be clearly traced" (1991, 7). Cf. Arafat 1995 on the temple of Hera at Olympia.

⁷⁸ *AR* 1984-5 and 1983-4; Petrakos 1984, 135-6.

which was somewhat smaller than the later version.⁷⁹ In addition to these structures there are plentiful finds of pottery to indicate some sort of cult activity on the site from the early sixth century, but nothing positively to identify the deity or deities worshipped in the archaic period.⁸⁰ The earliest votive which can unequivocally be connected with either of our abstract goddesses is a fragment of a Corinthian helmet inscribed: “The Rhamnousians in Lemnos dedicated me to Nemesis”. This was previously dated to the beginning of the fifth century, in association with a party of Rhamnousians who served under Miltiades in the Lemnos campaign of 499 BC (Hdt 6.137-40), but Lewis and Jeffery point out that, although the helmet is undoubtedly a spoil of battle, no victory is mentioned, and the letter forms suggest a slightly later date, c.475-50 BC; it was presumably dedicated by Rhamnousian soldiers garrisoned on Lemnos.⁸¹ The earliest dedication to Themis is Sôstratos’ throne of the fourth century.

Was the archaic sanctuary sacred to Nemesis, and the worship of Themis a later development, given a proper place with the building of the smaller temple at the beginning of the fifth century? Burkert takes this line, explaining the addition in conceptual terms, “since taking offence [sc. *nemesis*] plays an immensely important role in preserving social order”.⁸² Such a conceptual link between Nemesis and Themis can certainly be argued for generally, but does not help with a relative dating of their cults. Themis has just as good a claim to an archaic cult as Nemesis, given her early establishment as a deity in epic.⁸³ Alternatively, we could think of the sixth century buildings as sacred to Themis, her cult moved to the small temple to make way for Nemesis, newly important in the wake of the battle of Marathon as defender of

⁷⁹ Cf. Miles, who suggests that “the wish for continuity at the sacred place” influenced the placing of the Classical temple of Nemesis (1989, 150-3, n.34). The earliest excavators mistakenly assigned the design of the late sixth-century temple to the Themis temple (Petrakos 1991, 20).

⁸⁰ The latest pottery from the terrace fill is from the first half of the fifth century, but most is of sixth century date, including fragments of loutrophoroi “appropriate to a chthonic cult” (AR 1983-4). A series of small rectangular herms of rustic style date from the late sixth century, as does a pair of stone sandals (AR 1984-5).

⁸¹ IG I³ 522 bis: Ραμνόσιοι οἱ ἐν Λέμνο[ι ἀ]νέ[θεσαν Νεμ]έσει. 499 BC date: SEG XXXVI 43. Petrakos 1988, no.706 pl.122b. Ib. no.701 pl.122a is a votive bronze wheel inscribed Ἐρόδορος ἀνέθεκεν; the author of AR remarks that this “is a reminder that the wheel was a later symbol of Nemesis” (AR 1985-6, 18 fig.17). For votive bronze wheels, cf. Osborne (1987, 185 fig. 61) on a late archaic dedication to Apollo from Rhodes: “Onesos the bronzesmith dedicated me to Apollo — the wheel of a cart”.

⁸² Burkert 1985a, 85.

⁸³ And see Vos 1956, 70 for the linguistic case for θέμις being an older concept than νέμεσις.

civilisation against the barbarians, though such a move would go against a general religious tendency to conservatism.⁸⁴ In either case, the dedication of a whole sanctuary to a deified abstraction is quite exceptional before the Hellenistic period, and even then the personification usually plays a subsidiary role to a more major deity. Troubled by the idea of a cult attached to “a mere personification of the moral idea of retribution”, Farnell posits a development of Nemesis at Rhamnous from an Artemis-Aphrodite Nemesis; his argument is based largely on a few testimonia which seem to link Artemis and Nemesis, which could equally be read as later syncretisms, but his doubts are understandable.⁸⁵ Petrakos betrays a similar unease in his rather purple description of Nemesis as “the agrarian goddess who looked after the allocation of grazing grounds and concerned herself with the stability and preservation of rural order. These functions were in keeping with the situation of her sanctuary, the gentleness and softness of the forms, the peaceful sunlit shore and calm isolation of the locality...”⁸⁶ One important question which may have some bearing on the sanctuary’s pre-fifth century history has scarcely been raised by any commentator, however. Who worshipped there — just the people of the local demes of Rhamnous and (given the Sacred Way) Trikorynthos, or a wider clientele? I shall consider Rhamnous’ links with Athens in the fifth century further below, but there is nothing to suggest that the sanctuary was of more than local significance in the archaic period, though this might extend to two other demes of the Marathonian Tetrapolis by the late sixth century.⁸⁷ If this is the case, a purely local deity would be unsurprising as dedicatee, and at least a hypothetical case can be made for Nemesis being worshipped in Attika in the sixth

⁸⁴ See the proverb μή κινεῖ Καμάριναν (e.g. *AP* 9.685, *Or. Sib.* 3.736). But cf. de Polignac on the conscious “recycling” of sacred space for a different deity, as with the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas at Epidauros (Alcock and Osborne, eds., 1994, 9). The small sanctuary just south-west of the entrance to the fortress of Rhamnous underwent a change of dedicatee towards the end of the fourth century, when the local hero Aristomachos seems to have given way to the better-known healing hero Amphiaraos, due probably to the demands of a more cosmopolitan garrison; see Pouilloux 1954, 93-102, inscriptions nos. 30-5. Parker (1996, 176) comments on a general trend for older healing heroes “to be intruded upon by the younger heroes of broader fame”.

⁸⁵ Farnell 1896-1909, II 488-96.

⁸⁶ Petrakos 1991, 7; he explicitly rejects the association of the founding of Nemesis’ cult with the Persian Wars, because of his pre-fifth century finds.

⁸⁷ Three out of the four demes of the Tetrapolis (Marathon, Oinoe and Trikorynthos) are grouped together with Rhamnous (along with Aphidna and Phaleron) in the smallest of the Kleisthenic tribes, IX Aiantis. Whitehead (1986, 23-30) argues that Kleisthenes’ system was fundamentally organic, based on existing links.

century, before she was known elsewhere, as we shall see in the next chapter.⁸⁸ The addition of the temple to Themis at the beginning of the fifth century might reflect an aspect of Nemesis, indicating that her role as defender of justice and social order had gained in importance as the surrounding demes grew during the sixth century. After the Persian Wars, however, Nemesis' rapid rise to prominence as avenger of Attic pride kept Themis in a secondary position, and it is as Nemesis' primary place of worship that the sanctuary is best known.

ATHENS AND GE THEMIS

At Rhamnous, then, although Themis seems to have become established by the very end of the archaic period, no link with Gaia is apparent. The connection between the two seen at Delphi, however, is first made explicit by an Athenian poet, and it is at Athens that we finally come to epigraphic evidence for a Ge Themis. In the Theatre of Dionysos seats are reserved for a number of religious officials who have the goddess' name in their titles. There is possibly a "priest of Themis", although most of the name is missing (ἱερέως Θέ[μιδος], *IG* II² 5109), an "Olephoros of Athena Themis" (ὀληφόρου Ἀθηνᾶς Θέμιδος, *IG* II² 5103), a "priestess of Ge Themis" (ἱερίας Γῆς Θέμιδος, *IG* II² 5130), and "two Hersephoroi of Chloe Themis" (ἑρσηφόροις β' Χλόης Θέμιδος, *IG* II² 5098). None of these is in the front row of thrones, but three are in the same *kerkis*, first on the right from the center; 5098 is in the fifth row back, 5103 in the tenth, and 5109 in the twentieth. The priestess of Ge Themis has her seat a little further round in the third *kerkis* on the right from the centre, in the second row back. Given the clearly honorific status of the front row, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that a rough hierarchy might have attached to reserved places further back in the auditorium, implying higher status for the priestess of Ge Themis than the others, though this point cannot be pushed. Nor can an exact date for the inscriptions be easily established. Maaß discusses the front row of thrones in detail, some of which can be individually dated, and which range from the theatre's refurbishment under Lykourgos in 338-22 BC to the second century AD.⁸⁹ The rows behind the thrones,

⁸⁸ See below pp.96-9 on Nemesis and the *Kypria*. Cf. the obscure names attested in the Tetrapolis' sacred calendar (*IG* II² 1358; Whitehead 1986, 190-4; Rosivach 1994, 29-46).

⁸⁹ Maaß 1972. See Mitchell 1970 on the late fourth-century context; Humphreys 1985 for a more detailed study of Lykourgos and the mechanisms of his reforms, and most recently Parker 1996, 242-55. On the theatre in general, see Pickard-Cambridge 1946, 141-2. On

however, have unfortunately not received such in-depth treatment; the editors of *IG II*² assign 5083-164 all to the Roman imperial period, but these inscriptions are of much inferior workmanship, and many, carved on the upper surface of the step rather than below the seat, have been badly worn away, making detailed study difficult. Even if the inscriptions were more accurately dated, however, there is no way of determining, without external evidence, whether the offices mentioned are of long establishment or recent innovation.⁹⁰

Putting aside the question of date, then, let us look more closely at the four inscriptions in question. I am inclined to be sceptical about the reconstruction which gives us a “priest of Themis”; the rule that female deities have female attendants does have exceptions, but, as we have seen, Themis has a priestesses at Rhamnous in the late fourth/early third century, and we will shortly encounter an Athenian priestess of Themis.⁹¹ The “Olephoros” inscription is our only evidence for an Athena Themis. The title of the office gives us little further information about the cult, since an ὀληφόρος is simply the bearer of the οὐλαί, the barley-corns to be sprinkled on the sacrificial victim and altar prior to the slaughter, part of the standard procedure for blood sacrifice.⁹² That this particular barley-bearer should have a theatre-seat of her own, though, would indicate unusually high status for such an attendant, suggesting that she belonged to a major sanctuary. As we have no other information on Athena Themis, we can but speculate that the title had become attached to one of the many cult statues of Athena on the Akropolis.⁹³ The “two Hersephoroi of Chloe Themis” are more revealing. According to LSJ, ἐρσηφόροι is an alternative spelling for ἄρρηφόροι, the best known being the two young girls who lived on the Akropolis for a year, then carried the secret symbols of Athena in procession from and back to the temple of Athena Polias. It is not clear what the Arrhephoroi of Athena actually carried, but the literal meaning “dew-bearers” seems appropriate for Chloe Themis, an

the successive stages of the theatre's building and problems of dating, see Wycherley 1978, 206-15, Travlos 1971, 537-52 (though neither has much to say about the priest-seats).

⁹⁰ See Maaß (1972, 99-101) on the problems of using the inscriptions as evidence for the history of cult.

⁹¹ Rhamnous priestess: *IG II*² 3109, 4638 (see above). On “gender asymmetry for priests and priestesses”, see Cole 1992, 111-13. Cf. Connelly 1996, 60 and n.46 on the gender of Athena's attendants.

⁹² Burkert 1985a, 56.

⁹³ On which see Ridgway 1996.

otherwise unattested “Verdant Order”.⁹⁴ There was an Attic spring festival called the Chloaia, “the shooting of the stalks”, in honour of Demeter, and it is Demeter who usually bears the epithet Chloe.⁹⁵

A further general problem with the priest-seat inscriptions is raised by the cases of both Chloe Themis and Ge Themis. It is generally assumed that the theatre seats were each designated for *one* priest or priestess, although he or she might officiate for a cult which worshipped more than one deity. If only one deity is mentioned the case is clear, as the priest of Heavenly Nemesis certainly had a seat to himself (*IG* II² 5070), or, if two deities are mentioned, supplementary evidence may indicate that they were worshipped together, as in the case of the priest of Eukleia and Eunomia.⁹⁶ The lack of punctuation, however, means that some cases are not so clear. Just behind the seat of the priestess of Ge Themis, for example, is a place for ὕμνητρίας [ἱερ]ίας Κου[ρ]οτρόφου Δήμ[ητρος] Πειθοῦς (*IG* II² 5131). Are we to understand three separate goddesses here — Kourotrophos, Demeter, Peitho — all served by the one “singer-priestess”? Or should we envisage two or three priestesses sharing the rights to one seat?⁹⁷ Even if we take Kourotrophos as an epithet of Demeter, we still have two deities — not only is a “Child-nurturing Demeter Peitho” rather implausible, but a wider space before Πειθοῦς in the inscription would suggest that the word is to be taken separately. Since Peitho is nowhere else associated with Demeter, this apparent conflation of their cults is surprising. An ingenious explanation is offered by Price, who relates the theatre-seat inscriptions to Pausanias’ description of the south slope of the Akropolis. After leaving the sanctuary of Asklepios, walking towards the Beulé Gate, Pausanias records a temple of Themis and a memorial to Hippolytos, then, after

⁹⁴ Paus. 1.27.4. The Arrhephoria ritual is mirrored by the myth of the daughters of Kekrops, and Burkert suggests that the literal meaning of “dew-bearers” may be connected with Pandrosos, whose shrine is in front of the Erechtheion, facing the sacred olive tree: “moist with dew, it embodies the continuity of the order of the polis” (Burkert 1985a, 228-9). Cf. *IG*² 5099 for a theatre seat “for two Hersephoroi of Eilithyia ἐν Ἀργαίῃς”.

⁹⁵ Parker 1987, 141-2; Whitehead 1986, 192 n.86.

⁹⁶ On Nemesis Ourania, see below pp.111-12. Theatre seat: ἱερέως Εὐκλείας καὶ Εὐνομίας (*IG* II² 5059); two other inscriptions mention a ἱερεύς of Eukleia and Eunomia (*IG* II² 3738, 4193). See Hamdorf 1964 for further references. Other “multi-deity” seat inscriptions include one for the priest of Demos and the Charites and Roma (*IG* II² 5047), and one for the priest of Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira. Conversely, two seats are designated simply Ἡβης (*IG* II² 5150, 5154); are these for two officiants of the same cult, or for priest(esses) of two different cults of Hebe, or is the multiplicity due to the place having been moved?

⁹⁷ Apart from the front-row thrones, individual places are not obviously marked off, perhaps allowing more than one person to occupy the space covered by a longer inscription.

a digression on the story of Hippolytos and Phaidra, statues of Aphrodite Pandemos and Peitho, and a sanctuary of Ge Kourotrophos and Demeter Chloe; he concludes rather tantalizingly with the advice that “you can find out all about these names by discussing them with the priests” (1.22.1-3). Price, following Beschi, argues that 5131 is shorthand for “the singer-priestess of (Ge) Kourotrophos, Demeter (Chloe), and Peitho”, envisaging one priestess as serving two closely neighbouring small shrines, which Beschi locates on the rocky terrace immediately below the Athena Nike bastion (FIG. 10).⁹⁸ It should perhaps be pointed out that there is a seat “for the priestess of Demeter Chloe (and) of Diophantos” (*IG II²* 5059) more or less in front of the priestess of Ge Themis’ place, which slightly undercuts Price’s argument in this case, but the principle seems reasonable, and a similar hypothesis could perhaps explain our two Hersephoroi of Chloe Themis. In a discussion of some of the topographical problems of the south slope of the Akropolis, Walker identifies a fourth-century structure at the west end of the Asklepieion terrace as Pausanias’ temple of Themis (FIG. 9).⁹⁹ If this is to be associated with our priestess of Ge Themis, we might posit that our two Hersephoroi in fact served both this and the sanctuary higher up the slope to the west of Ge Kourotrophos and Demeter Chloe, “of Chloe Themis” being shorthand for the three “double-barrelled” deities involved.¹⁰⁰

The evidence of the theatre-seat inscriptions, then, is far from clear, although it does seem to associate Themis with deities of agricultural fertility. Our earliest epigraphic testimony for Themis’ cult at Athens, however, makes no mention of Ge. A line from Nikomachos’ revision of “Solon’s” sacrificial calendar, set up in the Royal Stoa c.401 BC, stipulates expenditure in the month Metageiton of 12 drachmas on “a ewe for Themis”.¹⁰¹ Whether this sacrifice to Themis was already established in the

⁹⁸ See Price 1978, 8 and 101-32, on Ge as the primary Athenian Kourotrophos (esp. 106-7 on the location of Pausanias’ shrine and 113 on *IG II²* 5131). Beschi 1967-8, 517-26; see further below pp.136-46 on Aphrodite Pandemos and Peitho.

⁹⁹ Walker 1979, 244-8. See also Aleshire 1989, 21-3.

¹⁰⁰ A connection with Gaia/Demeter could explain the otherwise obscure reference in Clement of Alexandria to “the forbidden symbols of Themis, marjoram, the lamp, the sword, the women’s comb, which is to say, euphemistically and in the manner of the Mysteries, ‘the female genitals’.” (τῆς Θέμιδος τὰ ἀπόρρητα σύμβολα ὀρίγανον, λύχνος, ξίφος, κτεῖς γυναικεῖος, ὃ ἐστὶν εὐφρόμως καὶ μυστικῶς εἰπεῖν μόριον γυναικεῖον. *Protrepticus* 2.22.5). Such “forbidden symbols” suggest a mystery cult, more likely to be attached to a fertility goddess than to a personified abstraction; Clement is, incidentally, a source for the story that Aischylos was charged with impiety for revealing details of the Eleusinian Mysteries. See Roberts 1975 on the passage.

¹⁰¹ *LSS* 10.fr.A.col.III.60: Θέμιδι οἶς. On the calendar, see Parker 1996, 43-55 and 218-20.

early sixth century, or whether it was one of the many more recently instituted rites which had made the revision of the calendar necessary is impossible to establish, given the fragmentary state of the inscription. A date no later than the last third of the sixth century can be argued for, however, if, as with the Thessalian cult, we take into account the evidence of theophoric names. The earliest securely attested Athenian bearer of a Themis-related name is the famous Themistokles, especially well represented amongst the ostraka found in the Agora and eponymous archon in 493/2 BC, who must have been born, and named, c.525 BC.¹⁰² The *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* records no fewer than 52 later Attic individuals called Themistokles, as well as several Classical and Hellenistic bearers of a number of variations on the theme.¹⁰³ An independent fifth-century Themis is also mentioned by Herodotos (2.50), as one of the few deities whose name he considers to be Pelasgian rather than Egyptian in origin. That Themis continued to have an independent cult at least until the mid-third century BC is suggested by two small dedications from the Athenian Asklepieion, recorded in the sanctuary inventory lists: “a tetradrachm and eyes from the priestess of Themis”.¹⁰⁴ The “eyes” must refer to the votive offering of a representation of the body-part in question, as was standard practice in Asklepieia all over the Greek world, and remains a feature of modern Greek Orthodox ritual.¹⁰⁵ Given the close proximity of the Asklepieion to the proposed location of Pausanias’ sanctuary of Themis (FIG. 9), it is very tempting to associate the dedications with a priestess from this neighbouring shrine.

Such an independent Themis need not be incompatible with the theatre-seat testimonia if we either follow Price in allowing for some sort of conflation of priestessly roles, or more simply posit that Themis became identified with Ge in cult only at a later date. The *conceptual* link between Themis and deities of agricultural fertility can, however, be traced much further back. Our earliest sources for Gaia’s connection with Themis at Athens are the *Eumenides* passage already mentioned (458 BC), which follows Hesiod in making Themis Gaia’s daughter, and a passage in the

¹⁰² Agora XXV.664-1049, *IG* I² 1035; *LGPN* II s.v. Θεμιστοκλῆς 39.

¹⁰³ *LGPN* II s.v. Θεμισθαγόρας, Θεμισθιος, Θεμιστᾶς, Θεμιστία, Θεμιστιος, Θεμιστοδίκη, Θεμιστώ, Θεμισών, Θεμιτέυς.

¹⁰⁴ *IG* II² 1534.252 (= Aleshire 1989, Inventory V.127b-c), 250/49 BC: τέτραχμον Θέμιδος ἱερείας καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ.

¹⁰⁵ Compare e.g. the collection of dedications from the Corinthian Asklepieion with the metal *tamata* hung up beneath icons of the Virgin Mary in many Greek churches.

Prometheus Bound which explicitly identifies the two. Prometheus tells the chorus, “My mother Themis, and Earth, of many names but one form, had often foretold to me how the future would come to pass...”¹⁰⁶ A reference to Delphi and the previous owners myth might be seen here, given the oracular context, but problems with the authorship and dating of the play make it impossible to establish the exact relationship between this and the *Eumenides* passage.¹⁰⁷ The identification of the two goddesses in the *Prometheus* passage certainly need not be taken literally as evidence for a cult of Ge Themis, and may even be an innovation, since it is made so pointedly, descent from Themis putting the protagonist in a stronger position against Zeus.¹⁰⁸ We have seen intimations of Themis’ link with the natural world in the Hesiodic genealogy which makes her mother of the Seasons as well as daughter of Gaia, and a general association with prosperity in the Bakchylides and Pindar passages, prosperity in any pre-modern society being closely tied up with agricultural fertility.¹⁰⁹

Conversely, Earth can be demonstrated to have her political side. One of the *Homeric Hymns* is addressed to “Earth Mother of All”, and although it is mostly concerned with agricultural fertility, those who are blessed by Gaia “rule orderly in their cities of fair women”.¹¹⁰ Burkert comments on the occurrence in philosophical speculation of the worship of Gaia “as a prototype of all piety”, despite the relatively modest place of the Earth in actual religious practice, and notes Gaia’s political aspect: “the earth not only sustains, but also imposes obligations on her native sons.”¹¹¹ This

¹⁰⁶ *P.V.* 211-13: ἐμοὶ δὲ μήτηρ οὐχ ἅπαξ μόνον Θέμις, / καὶ Γαῖα, πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφὴ μία, / τὸ μέλλον ἢ κρανοῖτο προὔτεθεσπίκει. Cf. Slatkin (1991, 74-7) on Thetis and the *P.V.*

¹⁰⁷ See Griffith 1977 and Bees 1993 for extensive, if inconclusive, discussion of the *P.V.*’s attribution to Aischylos and date. Bees argues for a *terminus post quem* of c.445 (on the basis of a comparison with Herodotos). Corsano (1988, 66 n.10) accepts Aischylean authorship, but “Non crediamo ci siano dati sufficienti per ipotizzare che Eschilo si è riferito a tradizioni mitiche o a culti esistenti al riguardo.”

¹⁰⁸ Gantz 1993, 52. Corsano (1988, 61) inverts the usual interpretation that the Titans represent the *demos* overturning the tyrannical, aristocratic rule of Zeus: “Prometeo rappresenta l’antico ordine, Zeus personifica il nuovo, cioè l’arbitrio tirannico che si sostituisce alla legalità tradizionale...” — hence Prometheus’ association with Themis. In Aischylos’ *Suppliants* (465-59 BC) Themis is *Dios* (360), which seems to imply daughter, rather than nurse or wife, of Zeus; Gantz suggests that “she acts in some way as his representative” (1993, 53).

¹⁰⁹ Some usages of θέμις ἐστὶ suggest that “the law of nature” is meant: e.g. Agamemnon swears he has not slept with Briseis, as is *themis* for men and women (*Il.* 9.134), whereas it is *not themis* for men to try to stay young (Bakchylides 3.88-90, Maehler).

¹¹⁰ *Hom. Hymn* 30. 11-12: αὐτοὶ δ’ εὐνομίῃσι πόλιν κάτα καλλιγύναικα / κοιρανέουσι.

¹¹¹ Burkert 1985a, 175. Earth as “mother of all”: Aisch. *Prom.* 90, *Sept.* 16-19. Ge as first and eldest of the gods: Plato *Tim.* 40b. Ge as mother of men and beloved of the gods: Plato *Menex.* 238a.

can be seen in a specifically Athenian context in Solon's celebration of his own reforms: "May the mighty mother of the Olympian gods bear witness in the court of Time, noblest black Earth, from whom I once lifted the boundary-stones planted in many places; then enslaved, now she is free".¹¹² The traditional explanation of this passage — that the boundary-stones marked mortgaged land, their removal signifying the cancellation of debts and return of land to its rightful owners — has been questioned, and exactly what Solon's reforms entailed is much debated.¹¹³ Whatever the historical accuracy of the poem, however, it certainly demonstrates Earth's involvement in political propaganda, appealed to as witness to Solon's establishment of social justice via redistribution of land.¹¹⁴

CONCLUSION

From this brief survey it would seem that an archaic cult of Themis can be demonstrated for Thessaly, where she seems to be of sufficient status to take the place of Hera and to have a month named after her, and possibly at Athens, though the small sacrifice mentioned in Nikomachos' calendar would not suggest a high position in the state pantheon. Themis' conceptual association with Gaia, explicit in Athenian literature from the fifth century, becomes enshrined in cult only at a later date, quite possibly not until after the mid-third century BC. About the early history of the sanctuary at Rhamnous we can only really speculate, but the worship of Themis there from at least the beginning of the fifth century suggests an interesting alternative association with Nemesis. At Delphi it is again unclear whether Themis had any archaic presence in cult, but an early conceptual connection between Themis and

¹¹² Fr. 36 West, 1-5: συμμαρτυροίη ταῦτ' ἄν ἐν δίκη χρόνου/ μήτηρ μεγίστη δαιμόνων Ὀλυμπίων/ ἄριστα Γῇ μέλαινα, τῆς ἐγὼ ποτε/ ὅρους ἀνείλον πολλὰ χῆ πεπηγότας/ πρόσθεν δὲ δουλεύουσα, νῦν ἐλευθέρα.

¹¹³ On Solon's poetry in relation to his reforms, see Murray 1993, 181-200. See Foxhall (1997) for a review of scholarship and re-assessment of agricultural systems in early Greece.

¹¹⁴ An association between Themis and Gaia is further attested by one or two odd late references not specific to Athens. Eratosthenes records an alternative version of the myth that the infant Zeus was nursed by Gaia (Hes. *Theog.* 479-84): "Musaïos says that when Zeus was born he was entrusted by Rhea to Themis" (Μυσαῖος γάρ φησι Δία γεννώμενον ἐγχειρισθῆναι ὑπὸ Ῥέας Θέμιδι, *Katast.* 13). This rather recalls the *Homeric Hymn's* account of Apollo's upbringing (above). The same link between Zeus and Themis may be suggested by the Cretan *Hymn of the Kouretes*, around which Jane Harrison's *Themis* (1927) is structured: a description of the fertility and prosperity brought about by the birth of Zeus ends with injunction "leap for fair Themis" (θόρε κῆς Θέμιν κ[αλάν], l.36). Harrison addresses the question of Themis' connection with oracles in the last chapter (480-535). See West 1965, and below pp.194-5, on the date of the *Hymn*.

oracles is apparent in the use of the word θέμιστες; the concept of θέμις, at least, is implicated in Delphi's legitimisation of the laws and cults of developing *poleis*, but only in the fifth century do we have any evidence for the association being expressed in worship of Themis at Delphi. While Themis does have a place in archaic and classical cult, then, nowhere have we seen evidence to support the theory that Themis originated as an epithet of Gaia. While it is not inherently implausible, it would be difficult to prove, as the process of separation would have to have taken place before Homer. Hesiod's genealogy attests to an early association of the two in mythological thought, but the complete absence of Ge/Gaia as a cult title of Themis throughout the archaic and classical periods would rather suggest that the reverse process took place. Rather than Themis originating as an aspect of Earth, it was Gaia's increasingly political aspect which led her to be associated with Themis, the personification of right and social order, because of a perceived communality of interests. Only at Athens, and no earlier than the Hellenistic period, can a final union of Ge-Themis be seen in cult.¹¹⁵

Everywhere except Thessaly Themis would seem to fit with Burkert's model of a personification beginning life as a literary figure, mediating between the mythical gods and everyday morality, her cult developing during the course of the sixth century.¹¹⁶ Themis' extraordinary position in the Thessalian pantheon, however, though not attested before the fourth century, might be indicative of much greater antiquity in this region. Her relatively humble position in Homeric epic could be understood in the context of the poems' Panhellenic stance, which consistently presents a unified picture of the Olympian gods, ignoring or demoting myriad deities who must have been of great significance in particular localities. Such an approach is thoroughly explored by Laura Slatkin in her thought-provoking study of the *Iliad's* paradoxical presentation of Thetis, whose extraordinary position of simultaneous power and weakness, she argues, can only be explained in terms of the suppression of an alternative mythology where Thetis is a much more powerful figure.¹¹⁷ If we applied a similar hypothesis to Themis, we might see indications of such a "suppressed" mythology surfacing in the crucial advisory roles given to Themis by the

¹¹⁵ Sourvinou-Inwood 1987, 240 n.62: "In my view, Ge-Themis is a later syncretism; Themis was not identified with Gaia in fifth-century religion".

¹¹⁶ See above pp.62-3.

¹¹⁷ Slatkin 1991; see especially 77-84.

Kypria and Pindar (*Isthmian* 8). Before coming to a conclusion on Themis' origins, however, we should look at the closely related case of the cult of Nemesis at Rhamnous.

Chapter 3

NEMESIS: “MYTH INTO LOGOS?”¹

To every mortal is thy influence known,
And men beneath thy righteous bondage groan;
For ev’ry thought within the mind conceal’d
Is to thy sight perspicuously reveal’d...
All to see, hear, and rule, O pow’r divine
Whose nature Equity contains, is thine...
Give aid benignant in the needful hour,
And strength abundant to the reas’ning pow’r;
And far avert the dire, unfriendly race
Of counsels impious, arrogant, and base.

From the *Orphic Hymn to Nemesis*, tr. Thomas Taylor (1792)

Like Themis, Nemesis has some mythology attached to her, and one might almost argue that she has too much “personality” to count as a personification, since, like many other minor goddesses and mortal women, she gets raped by Zeus.² This borderline position between deity and personification makes Nemesis a good case study for our definitional problems, and potentially gives her a mediating role between “mythical” and “logical” modes of thought; I would argue that from her earliest appearances in literature Nemesis encompasses both ends of the spectrum, being at the same time a personal figure of mythology and an allegorical representation of an abstract idea. The chronological range Nemesis’ cult spans, from the sixth century until well into the Roman period, is exceptional, as is the relatively high profile of her sanctuary at Rhamnous. This chapter will focus on Nemesis’ cult in Attika, where it is first and most extensively attested, but I shall also examine the case of the two Nemeseis of Smyrna, for whom an archaic cult has often been posited, and conclude with a brief consideration of the development of Nemesis’ iconography, since it has implications for the “myth v. *logos*” debate.

The word “Nemesis” has long been used in English to denote “retributive justice”, the all-seeing nature of Taylor’s goddess being reflected in the sense of

¹ An early version of this chapter was delivered as a paper to the graduate research seminar at Exeter in June 1995; I owe much to the comments of those present, especially John Wilkins, who subsequently kindly sent me a number of helpful references and suggestions, and David Harvey, who found me a copy of the 1983 edition of the site guide. Keith Armstrong drew my attention to Taylor’s delightful translations.

² See Farnell’s comment on the pursuit story attached to Themis, above p.73.

“inevitability” attaching to the abstract.³ She is also one of the few deities not to have acquired a Latin name when adopted by the Romans, perhaps indicating a difficulty of translation.⁴ Our understanding of *nemesis* has been much influenced by its traditional association with *hybris*: *nemesis* is the punishment inevitably meted out by the gods to mortals guilty of forgetting the limitations of their mortality, arousing the jealousy of the gods, boasting over-confidently or enjoying an excess of good fortune. Nick Fisher’s thorough re-evaluation of *hybris* has shown, however, that surprisingly few passages actually make this association explicitly, and *hybris*, rather than being primarily a religious term denoting an attitude particularly offensive to the gods, most often refers to “specific acts or general behaviour directed against others”; *hybris* can be defined essentially as the “serious assault on the honour of another, which is likely to cause shame, and lead to anger and attempts at revenge”.⁵ Clearly this has implications for our understanding of *nemesis*, which may require some adjustment; while a complementary study of the usage of *nemesis* is beyond the scope of this chapter, I hope an examination of the goddess will shed some light on the concept she personifies. Some provisional definition is necessary, however, and two basic strands of meaning may be noted in the noun’s derivation from νέμω, to “distribute, apportion”: the idea of “first distribution”, the lot with which you are born, associates Ν/νέμεσις with fate,⁶ while the alternative idea of “distribution of what is due” makes the link with justice, an association strengthened by the usage of the linguistically related νόμος for “law”. The latter aspect seems to be the most commonly emphasised, so perhaps the most generally applicable translation of νέμεσις is “righteous anger” or “indignation” aroused by injustice.⁷

³ *OED*: Nemesis (1553) 1. The goddess of retribution; hence, one who avenges or punishes. 2. Retributive justice; an instance of this (1597). “Guilt... produces a fear of the divine N.” (1733). A ride at Alton Towers is called Nemesis, presumably in the vague sense of “the Thing that is waiting for you” rather than “your just deserts”.

⁴ *Poena*, the nearest Latin equivalent, is not listed in Axtell’s catalogue of Roman deified abstractions, though a literary *Poena* appears in Statius (*Theb.* 8.25), and plural *Poenae* are sometimes identified with the Furies, e.g. Cicero, *in Pis.* 37.91. Cf. below p.198. See Axtell (1907, 44-5) on Nemesis’ Roman cult.

⁵ Fisher 1992, 1; see 142-8 on specifically “religious” *hybris*. *Contra*, see Cairns 1996a.

⁶ Two other “fate” words, μοῖρα and εἰμαρμένη, are also derived from a verb of “receiving one’s share”, μέιρομαι.

⁷ Fisher advocates “anger” or “indignation” as generally safer translations than “vengeance” (1992, 358 n.81). See Laroche 1949 for a full, if dated, discussion of νέμω, νέμεσις, νόμος and νομίζω; he concludes with the definition of νέμεσις as “rancune, vengeance, jalousie; répartitrice, destinée” (256); on the personification he comments

HESIOD'S NEMESIS

Nemesis' earliest appearances are in Hesiod. The *Theogony* makes her one of the many offspring of Night, along with sundry other personifications:

Night bore hateful Destiny and black Doom and Death, and she bore Sleep, and the tribe of Dreams. And again gloomy Night bore Blame and painful Woe, though she slept with none of the gods, and the Hesperides, who guard the beautiful golden apples and the trees which bear the fruit beyond glorious Okeanos. Also she bore the Destinies and the relentlessly-avenging Fates, Klôtho, Lachesis and Atropos, who give mortals at their birth both good and bad to have, and who pursue the transgressions of both men and gods, nor do the goddesses cease from their terrible anger until they punish whoever has sinned with an evil visitation. Also deadly Night bore Nemesis, a bane for mortal men, and after her Deceit and Affection and destructive Old Age and strong-spirited Strife.⁸

Like most of Hesiod's genealogies, this can be read in fairly allegorical terms. Most of Night's children are rather "dark" characters, for one reason or another: Sleep and Dreams literally happen in the night time; Death is associated by analogy; the Hesperides live in the land beyond the sunset; Blame and Woe might be thought to trouble you especially at night.⁹ Though ideas of fate are not necessarily negative, the various facets associated with Night here all emphasise the darker side: Moros, not personified elsewhere, and Kêr are usually used of a man's allotted death; the Moirai are characterised as relentless, inescapable forces against which we struggle in vain.¹⁰ Nemesis is explicitly a πῆμα, a "woe" for mortals, not an obviously suitable description for "justice", so the word may well be being used in its more literal sense of "allotment", especially given the company of the Fates. In their pursuit of "those who overstep", the Moirai here seem to be carrying out a task elsewhere specifically assigned to Nemesis, as we shall see.¹¹

"chacun des aspects de la Némésis a été et reste l'objet de controverses sans fin" (89). On *aidôs* and *nemesis*, see below n.13.

⁸ Hes. *Theog.* 211-25: Νύξ δ' ἔτεκε στυγερὸν τε Μόρον καὶ Κῆρα μέλαιναν/καὶ Θάνατον, τέκε δ' Ὕπνον, ἔτικτε δὲ φύλον Ὀνειρώων./ δεύτερον αὖ Μῶμον καὶ Ὀϊζὺν ἀλγινόεσσιν/ οὐ τινι κοιμηθεῖσα θεῶν τέκε Νύξ ἐρεβεννή./ Ἑσπερίδας θ', αἷς μῆλα πέρην κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο/ χρύσεα καλὰ μέλουσι φέροντά τε δένδρεα καρπὸν/ καὶ Μοίρας καὶ Κῆρας ἐγείνατο νηλεοποίνους./ [Κλωθὴ τε Λάχεσιν τε καὶ Ἀτροπον, αἷ τε βροτοῖσι/ γεινομένοισι διδοῦσιν ἔχειν ἀγαθὸν τε κακὸν τε,]/ αἷ τ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε παραιβασίας ἐφέπουσιν,/ οὐδέ ποτε λήγουσι θεὰ δεινοῖο χόλοιο./ πρὶν γ' ἀπὸ τῷ δώσει κακὴν ὄπιν, ὅστις ἀμάρτη/ τίκτε δὲ καὶ Νέμεσιν πῆμα θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι/ Νύξ ὀλοή μετὰ τὴν δ' Ἀπάτην τέκε καὶ Φιλότητα/ Γῆρας τ' οὐλόμενον, καὶ Ἔριν τέκε καρτερόθυμον.

⁹ Cf. *AP* 16.265-6 for Hellenistic images of Mōmos as an emaciated old man.

¹⁰ Harrison (1903, 166) nicely describes the Keres as "like a sort of personified bacilli". On Night's family see West 1966, 35-6 and 227-30, and Duchemin 1980, 8-9.

¹¹ On Night's family see West 1966, 35-6 and 227-30, and Duchemin 1980, 8-9.

A more positive Nemesis can be seen in the *Works and Days*, where she is linked with Aidôs, both leaving the earth at the end of the Age of Iron:

And then will Aidôs and Nemesis go to Olympos from the wide-pathed earth, their fair forms wrapped in white robes, abandoning mankind for the company of the immortals; bitter sorrows will be left for mortal men, and there will be no defence against evil.¹²

Although the mythological element is more apparent here, with the two characters explicitly anthropomorphised and on their way to stay with the Olympian gods, the allegorical message is hardly far to seek: in our degraded times shame and righteous indignation are no more to be found. Instead, “men will praise the doer of evil and his *hybris*; justice will be in physical strength...” (191-2). Nemesis’ association with the idea of *aidôs*, “shame, modesty, respect”, the observing of proper relationships and limits, is quite consonant with Homeric usage of the abstract noun: feeling *nemesis* is Telemachos’ reaction to Athene/Mentes’ having been left unattended at the door for some time, and to the Suitors’ arrogant behaviour.¹³ Aidôs appears personified once or twice elsewhere in archaic poetry and art, and there is some evidence for a cult at Athens, and possibly also at Sparta, but she remains a shadowy figure beside her defender.¹⁴ The context also firmly establishes Nemesis’ connection with justice;

¹² Hes. *Op.* 197-201: καὶ τότε δὴ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης/ λευκοῖσιν φάρεσσι καλυψαμένω χροῖα καλὸν/ ἀθανάτων μετὰ φῦλον ἵτον προλιπόντ’ ἀνθρώπους/ Αἰδῶς καὶ Νέμεσις· τὰ δὲ λείπεται ἄλγεα λυγρὰ/ θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι· κακοῦ δ’ οὐκ ἔσσεται ἀλκή. On the whole “race of iron” passage, see Fisher 1992, 191-3, and Cairns 1993, 152-6.

¹³ *Od.* 1.119-20, 226-9; see Fisher 1992, 162-3. In Homer the noun is used particularly in the phrase οὐ νέμεσις plus the infinitive, “it is no cause for anger that...”, e.g. οὐ γὰρ τις νέμεσις φυγέειν κακόν (*Il.* 14.80). The scholiast on Hesiod *Op.* 200 remarks that “Ὅμηρος τὸ μὲν πρῶγμα οἶδε, τὴν δὲ θεὸν οὐ”. On *nemesis* as Homeric society’s primary expression of disapproval of lack of *aidôs*, see Cairns 1993, 51-4, 56, 84-6, 98; Redfield 1975, 115-18. Turpin (1980) argues for a popular exclamation αἰδῶς καὶ νέμεσις underlying Homeric usage of the terms.

¹⁴ Pindar, *O.* 7.44, *N.* 9.34-4, 36-7; Sophokles, *OC* 1267-9. Red-figure amphora by Phintias, inscription ΑΙΔΩΣ by figure of Artemis (*ARV²* 23, 1), where the context is rape (see Cairns 1996b). Athenian cult:- Altar: Pausanias 1.17.1, localised on the Akropolis by Eustathius, *Comm. ad Il.* 22.451, p.1279.39 ff; Hesych. s.v. Αἰδοῦς βωμός; *Suda* s.v. Αἰδῶς. Seat for priestess in theatre of Dionysus: *IG II²* 5147. Generally worshipped, with Dike and Eunomia: Demosthenes, *In Aristogeit.* 25.35. Possible Sparta cult:- General belief: Xenophon, *Conv.* 8.35. Statue near city, associated with Penelope: Pausanias 3.20.10 (see Eckstein 1981 for an attempt to identify this with an extant statue of c.460 BC). On *A/aidôs* in literature, see Cairns 1993; on Aidôs at Sparta, see Richer (forthcoming); on the “reality” of Aidôs, “la conscience morale” (104), as a cult figure, see Hani 1980.

interestingly in a re-working of the passage in Aratos' *Phainomena* it is Dike herself who leaves the earth in disgust.¹⁵

NEMESIS MOTHER OF HELEN AND THE CULT AT RHAMNOUS

Nemesis' less abstract side comes to the fore in the myth that makes her mother of Helen by Zeus. While personifications are often fitted into genealogies of the "meaningful" Hesiodic variety, and can even, like Mêtis, occasionally be parent to a goddess, for a personified abstract to give birth to a mortal is otherwise unheard of.¹⁶ For a full account we have to turn to various late sources, of the first or second century AD, but the main elements of the story are all in place by the mid-sixth century in the *Kypria*. Following the advice of Themis, Zeus plans to punish the corruption of mankind and reduce the earth's over-population by means of a great war. To this end, Zeus begins by raping Nemesis:

And after these¹⁷ he begat a third child, Helen, a wonder among mortals. Beautiful-haired Nemesis once bore her, after being joined in love by force with Zeus, king of the gods. She fled, and was unwilling to be joined in love with father Zeus, son of Kronos, for *shame and indignation* distressed her heart. By land and by the dark, barren sea she fled, but Zeus pursued and longed in his heart to catch her. Now over the waves of the loud-roaring sea, she sped across the great deep in the form of a fish, now over the river of Ocean and the boundaries of Earth, now over the much-furrowed land; she kept turning into such terrible beasts as the land nurtures, in order to escape him.¹⁸

Note the rationalising element even in such a mythological story as this: Nemesis is motivated by "shame and indignation", by herself and by αἰδώς, the quality νέμεσις protects. Nemesis is unable to shake off her pursuer, and as a result Helen is born.¹⁹ A much later telling of the story fills in the details:

¹⁵ Aratos *Phain.* 96-136. She does so at the birth of the Bronze Age, and becomes the constellation we know as Virgo. Cf. Plato *Laws* 943d for Dike as daughter of Aidôs, both of whom are *nemesêtos* towards lies; see Fisher 1992, 490.

¹⁶ Personified rivers are always fathering children, and local nymphs get raped, but these are a slightly different matter from personified abstractions; see above pp.14 and 19.

¹⁷ The Dioskouri (Fr. 8 *PEG*).

¹⁸ Fr. 9 *PEG* = Athen. 8.334b: τοὺς δὲ μετὰ τριτάτην Ἑλένην τέκε, θαῦμα βροτοῖσι,/ τήν ποτε καλλίκομος Νέμεσις φιλότῃτι μιγεῖσα/ Ζηνὶ θεῶν βασιλῇι τέκε κρατερῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης/ φεῦγε γάρ, οὐδ' ἔθελεν μιχθήμεναι ἐν φιλότῃτι/ πατρὶ Διὶ Κρονιῶνι· ἐτείρετο γὰρ φρένας αἰδοῦ/ καὶ νεμέσει· κατὰ γῆν δὲ καὶ ἀτρύγετον μέλαν ὕδωρ/ φεῦγε, Ζεὺς δ' ἐδίωκε· λαβεῖν δ' ἐλιλαίετο θυμῷ/ ἄλλοτε μὲν κατὰ κῶμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης,/ ἰχθύι εἰδομένη πόντον πολὺν ἐξορόθυνεν,/ ἄλλοτ' ἂν Ὠκεανοῦ ποταμὸν καὶ πείρατα Γαίης,/ ἄλλοτ' ἂν ἥπειρον πολυβόλακα. γίγνετο δ' αἰεὶ/ θηρί' ὅς' ἥπειρος αἶνα τρέφει, ὄφρα φύγοι νιν.

¹⁹ Fr. 10 *PEG* = Philodemos *De Piet.*. In other literature before the *Bibliothèque* only fragments of the story are preserved: Sappho fr. 166 LP for Leda finding an egg;

Some say that Helen was the daughter of Nemesis and Zeus. While fleeing Zeus' company, Nemesis changed her shape into a wild goose, but Zeus took the likeness of a swan and had intercourse with her; from this union she bore an egg. A shepherd, finding this among the trees, rescued it and gave it to Leda; she put it in a chest to keep it safe, and when the time was right Helen was born, whom she brought up as her own daughter.²⁰

The attempt to reconcile the conflicting versions of Helen's parentage is interesting, and this version shows Leda in a less scandalous light than the better known story of her dalliance with Zeus in the form of a swan. An early Christian sermon gives a much abbreviated version: "By turning into a swan or a wild goose Zeus fathered Helen on Nemesis, though she is believed to have been Leda daughter of Thestios..."²¹

Our earliest evidence for the worship of Nemesis is at Rhamnous, and one first century BC/AD source locates the rape there, relating the story as part of a collection of catasterisation myths:

The Swan. This is the one called the Great, which they represent as a swan. It is said that Zeus took on this form because he was in love with Nemesis, since she changed into every shape in order to safeguard her virginity, and so he became a swan; thus he too took on the likeness of this bird and flew down to Rhamnous in Attika, and there he ruined Nemesis; but she bore an egg, from which Helen was pecked out and born, as the poet Kratinos says. And he himself did not change shape again, but flew up into the sky as he was, and he placed the image of the swan among the stars; it is flying just like he did then.²²

Bakchylides fr. 52 Maehler makes Nemesis mother of the Telchines. Asklepiades *FGrH* 12F11 records only that Zeus took the form of a swan and had intercourse with Nemesis. See below p.109 on Kratinos' *Nemesis*. See Gantz 1993 (319-21) on the sources for the story.

²⁰ <Apollodoros> *Bibliothēke* 3.10.7: λέγουσι δὲ ἔνιοι Νεμέσεως Ἑλένην εἶναι καὶ Διός. ταύτην γὰρ τὴν Διὸς φεύγουσαν συνουσίαν εἰς χῆνα τὴν μορφήν μεταβαλεῖν, ὁμοιωθέντα δὲ καὶ Δία κύκνῳ συνελθεῖν· τὴν δὲ ᾧον ἐκ τῆς συνουσίας ἀποτεκεῖν, τοῦτο δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἄλσεσιν εὐρόντα τινὰ ποιμένα Λήδα κομίσαντα δοῦναι, τὴν δὲ καταθεμένην εἰς λάρνακα φυλάσσειν, καὶ χρόνῳ καθήκοντι γεννηθεῖσαν Ἑλένην ὡς ἐξ αὐτῆς θυγατέρα τρέφειν.

²¹ <Clement of Rome> *Homil.* 5.13 (Rehm p.98): Νεμέσει τῇ Θεστίου τῇ καὶ Λήδα νομισθείσῃ κύκνος ἢ χῆν γενόμενος Ἑλένην ἐτεκνώσατο καὶ αὖθις ἀστὴρ γενόμενος Κάστορα καὶ Πολυδεύκην ἐξέφηεν (late first century AD).

²² <Eratosthenes> *Katasterismoi* 25 D, s.v. Κύκνου· οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ καλούμενος μέγας, ὃν κύκνῳ εἰκάζουσιν· λέγεται δὲ τὸν Δία ὁμοιωθέντα τῷ ζῳῷ τούτῳ Νεμέσεως ἐρασθῆναι, ἐπεὶ αὐτὴ πᾶσαν ἡμειβε μορφήν, ἵνα τὴν παρθενίαν φυλάξῃ, καὶ τότε κύκνος γέγονεν· οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸν ὁμοιωθέντα τῷ ὀρνέῳ τούτῳ καταπτῆναι εἰς Ῥαμνοῦντα τῆς Ἀττικῆς, κάκει τὴν Νέμεσιν φθεῖραι· τὴν δὲ τεκεῖν ᾧον, ἐξ οὗ ἐκκολαφθῆναι καὶ γενέσθαι τὴν Ἑλένην, ὥς φησι Κρατῖνος ὁ ποιητής. καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ μεταμορφωθῆναι αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' οὕτως ἀναπτῆναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ τὸν τύπον τοῦ κύκνου ἔθηκεν ἐν τοῖς ἀστροῖς· ἔστι δὲ ἱπτάμενος οἶος τότε ἦν. Augustus' librarian Hyginus gives much the same version, though without specifying a location. He adds that Venus assisted by taking the form of an eagle and pretending to pursue Zeus' swan, to which Nemesis inadvisedly gave shelter; the resulting egg was taken to Leda in Sparta by Mercury (2.8, s.v. *Olor*). The constellation Cygnus does indeed bear quite a passable resemblance to a swan in flight.

Linking Rhamnous with the rape myth is an obvious connection to make, providing a good *aition* for the cult's location, but few of our sources mention it explicitly. An odd reference in Kallimachos calls Helen "Rhamnousian", which would imply that Kallimachos was familiar with the association, and Kratinos' comedy *Nemesis* may have located a version of the "Helen in the egg" story at Rhamnous, as we shall see.²³

It is even possible that the *Kypria*'s inclusion of the rape story was prompted by the author's knowledge of the cult of Nemesis at Rhamnous. Davies follows Wackernagel's linguistic arguments that much of the Epic Cycle cannot be earlier than c.550, and fr.1 of the *Kypria* in particular has many Attic features, some not paralleled before the fifth century.²⁴ He suggests that frs.8-9 might fit in the context of the Judgement of Paris, perhaps in a speech by Aphrodite describing the reward she will give Paris for choosing her, and comments on the oddity of the shape-changing Nemesis, the folk-tale detail more usually being associated with Thetis and her pursuit by Peleus. Since a reluctant Thetis would clash with the picture implied by fr.2 of Hera *rewarding* the nymph with Peleus for having refused Zeus' advances, Davies suggests that the poet of the *Kypria* "transferred the motif, from its original and apposite association with the sea-sprite Thetis, to a rather less obviously appropriate connection with Nemesis, the personification of retribution".²⁵ But where does the story that Nemesis, rather than Leda, was Helen's mother come from? Davies points out that the Leda and the swan version, though more familiar to us, is first attested in Euripides' *Helen*, and could even be a Euripidean invention, implying that the Nemesis story was older.²⁶ We might elaborate on this argument, taking the linguistic evidence into consideration, and suggest that Nemesis' motherhood of Helen is specifically an Attic myth, first told by the people of Rhamnous about the goddess of their local sanctuary, taken up by the poet of the *Kypria*, who added the shape-changing motif. If we were to accept a sixth-century presence in the sanctuary for Themis, and thus a perceived association of the two goddesses, her role in this telling of the Trojan War myth would be given even more point, too. Themis suggests the War to Zeus as a cure for the earth's overpopulation, and the War is brought about

²³ Kallimachos *Hymn* 3, to Artemis: the Greeks were on their way to Troy, angry about 'Ελένη 'Ραμνουσίδι (232).

²⁴ Davies 1988, 3-5; Wackernagel, J. (1916) *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*, 178ff.

²⁵ Davies 1988, 35-9.

²⁶ Davies 198, 39.

by the woman to whom Nemesis gives birth — the power of Righteous Indignation working to fulfil the requirements of divine Order on the earth.²⁷

When describing the figures on the base of the cult statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous, Pausanias is as concerned as anyone to clear up confusion about Helen's parentage, explaining: "The Greeks say Nemesis was the mother of Helen, and that Leda only gave Helen the breast and reared her; in the same way they and everyone else believe that Helen's father was Zeus and not Tyndareos."²⁸ The text as it stands reads rather awkwardly: who is "everyone else" in opposition to "the Greeks"? Schubart (ed. 1853) deletes 'Ελληνες and inserts it later after ταῦτ'α instead of the codices' 'Ελένης, an emendation adopted by Hitzig and Blümner (eds. 1896). Frazer interprets the spirit of Schubart's text, rendering the second half of the sentence: "as for Helen's father, the people of Rhamnus are at one with all the rest of the Greeks in holding that he was Zeus..."²⁹ Such an interpretation could be facilitated by simply replacing 'Ελληνες in the first clause with a local reference: "The Rhamnousians say Nemesis was the mother of Helen...; in the same way both they and all the Greeks believe that (her) father was Zeus..."³⁰ This would reflect Pausanias' habitual interest in local variations in myth, and strengthen our case for the "Attic-ness" of Nemesis' motherhood of Helen. The attribution of *two* divine parents to Helen makes her a very special case amongst mortals, perhaps only paralleled by one or two cases of heroes resulting from unions between a god and a personified locality.³¹

As we have seen, the sanctuary at Rhamnous seems to have been in use from at least the early sixth century, although the earliest evidence for the identity of its owner is the early fifth-century helmet dedicated to Nemesis.³² Given Nemesis' role in the

²⁷ This kind of moral dimension is suggested by Apollo's summary of the story towards the end of Euripides' *Orestes* (1638-42), where the earth's overpopulation is explicitly a *hybris*: ἄλλην δὲ νόμφην ἐς δόμους κτῆσαι λαβών,/ ἐπεὶ θεοὶ τῷ τῆσδε καλλιστεύματι/ 'Ελληνας εἰς ἓν καὶ Φρύγας συνήγαγον,/ θανάτους τ' ἔθηκαν, ὥς ἀπαντλοῖεν χθονὸς/ ὕβρισμα θνητῶν ἀφθόνου πληρώματος.

²⁸ Paus. 1.33.7: 'Ελένη Νέμεσιν μητέρα εἶναι λέγουσιν 'Ελληνες, Λήδαν δὲ μαστὸν ἐπισχεῖν αὐτῇ καὶ θρέψαι· πατέρα δὲ καὶ οὗτοι καὶ πάντες κατὰ ταῦτ'α 'Ελένης Δία καὶ οὐ Τυνδάρεων εἶναι νομίζουσι.

²⁹ Frazer 1896, I 51-2.

³⁰ Thanks to Nick Fisher for drawing this problem to my attention, and suggesting the solution.

³¹ E.g. Zeus + Aigina = Aiakos (Pindar *N.*8.6-8, Paus. 2.5.1-2), Helios + Rhodes = seven sons (Pindar *O.*7.71-3). Burkert (1985, 185) suggests that the myths of rape and indignant withdrawal make Nemesis "very clearly a double of the raging Demeter Erinys".

³² Above p.81.

Kypria, however, a sixth-century Attic cult is perfectly plausible; an even earlier date could be sustained if we followed the arguments for the Epic Cycle containing material just as archaic as that used in the Homeric poems, although any pre-sixth-century cult has left no archaeological record.³³ In the absence of further information, the archaic history of the sanctuary must remain somewhat obscure, but with the fifth century the position improves rapidly, both because of the usual increase in material available for study and because of political circumstances which caused the sanctuary to take on wider significance than it had enjoyed in the archaic period.

RHAMNOUS IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

First, the material evidence. From the first quarter of the fifth century we have the putative Themis temple and the inscribed helmet, and a small temenos of an unidentified deity recently uncovered north-east of the temple of Nemesis may be of similar date, although previous excavation has apparently made this difficult to establish.³⁴ In the middle of the century, accounts of the financial resources, in reserve or on loan, “of Nemesis”, for five years between c.450 and 440 suggest that Nemesis’ cult was already flourishing.³⁵ At some point before the large temple was built the terrace reached its final form, with its impressive retaining walls to the north and east, and the fountain house and stoa to the north were built (FIGS. 6-7a).³⁶ Dinsmoor’s ascription of the Nemesis temple to the “Theseion architect” has been convincingly refuted by Miles, though the latter’s case for a date of 430-25, rather than the late 430s, has not found universal acceptance.³⁷ Various details, such as incomplete fluting on the extant column drums, suggest that building work was interrupted in its finishing stages, which would certainly be consonant with the disruption seen elsewhere in Attic construction work caused by the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, although they

³³ On the Epic Cycle and Homer, see Slatkin 1991, 9-14.

³⁴ Petrakos 1990, 1-3, fig. 1 and 1992, 8-9. There are traces of an altar and a small temple, of local stone.

³⁵ *IG I³* 248; Pouilloux 1954, no.35 (see 147-9 for discussion of the sums involved); ML no.53; Whitehead 1986, 387 no.100 (see 160 for discussion, and 170 on the lack of distinction between cult and deme funds; the Nemesis accounts are dated by demarchs).

³⁶ Petrakos 1991, 20 and 37; *contra* Pouilloux 1954, 55 n.1.

³⁷ Dinsmoor 1973, 181; Miles 1989, 221-242. Miles 1989 is the most recent extensive work on the architecture of the temple, but see Mark (1993, 77-8 n.47) for criticism of Miles’ stylistic dating criteria. See further below.

could alternatively be indicative of financial constraints *during* the War.³⁸ The temple is built of local marble, with pale blue veining, from nearby quarries at the southern end of the Rhamnountine plain, near the summit of the low pass leading to the modern seaside village of Ayia Marina, which may have been specially opened for the purpose.³⁹

Nemesis' new temple was equipped with a magnificent new cult statue. All are in agreement that it was the work of a sculptor of some renown, though exactly who seems to have been a subject of much ancient debate; some, including Pausanias, attributed the work to Pheidias, others to his pupil Agorakritos. Zenobios reports that it is the work of Pheidias, explaining the confusion thus:

Antigonos the Karystian says that a tiny plaque was suspended from this which bore the inscription: 'Made by Agorakritos of Paros'. This is not surprising; many other people also have written someone else's name on their own works. So it is likely that Pheidias had yielded to Agorakritos; for Agorakritos was his beloved, and in general Pheidias was driven to distraction over his favourite.⁴⁰

Photios likewise records the attribution to Pheidias, but suggests that the work was in some way dedicated to Agorakritos: "Pheidias made the statue, and his signature was a favour to Agorakritos of Paros, his beloved." He compares the case with that of Pheidias' Zeus at Olympia, the finger of which was apparently inscribed with the *kalos* name of another of the master's favourite pupils, one Pantarkes.⁴¹

Following Despinis' reconstruction of the statue, however, most modern art historians are in agreement that the statue was the work of Agorakritos on stylistic grounds, the misattributions easily explicable by the desire to ascribe the masterpiece

³⁸ On the "conspicuous gap" in Attic building between 432 and 424, see Mark 1993, 76-9. See also Hodge and Tomlinson 1969 on the unusual stippled panels on the vertical surfaces of the steps, usually regarded as a sign of lack of finish, but perhaps a deliberate feature; see Dinsmoor 1961 on the architrave.

³⁹ Hodge and Tomlinson 1969, 192 n.15.

⁴⁰ Zenobios 5.82, s.v. 'Ραμνουσία Νέμεσις: ἐξ οὗ φησιν Ἀντίγονος ὁ Καρύστιος πτύχιον τι μικρὸν ἐξηρτήσθαι τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχον· Ἀγοράκριτος Πάριος ἐποίησεν. οὐ θαυμαστὸν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι γὰρ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἔργων ἕτερον ἐπιγεγράφασιν ὄνομα. εἰκὸς οὖν καὶ τὸν Φειδίαν τῷ Ἀγορακρίτῳ συγκεχωρηκέναι· ἦν γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐρώμενος, καὶ ἄλλως ἐπτόητο περὶ τὰ παιδικά.

⁴¹ Photios *Lexicon* s.v. 'Ραμνουσία Νέμεσις: τὸ δ' ἄγαλμα Φειδίας ἐποίησεν, οὗ τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἐχαρίσατο Ἀγορακρίτῳ τῷ Παρίῳ ἐρωμένῳ, ὃς καὶ Ὀλυμπίασι τῷ δακτύλῳ τοῦ Διὸς ἐπέγραψε· Παντάρκης καλός· ἦν δὲ οὗτος Ἀργεῖος, ἐρώμενος αὐτοῦ. The *Suda* tells the same story, though giving the *kalos* name as Αὐτάρκης (s.v. 'Ραμνουσία Νέμεσις).

to the more famous master.⁴² In addition to the question of the identity of the sculptor, though, the statue itself is supposed to have undergone something of an identity crisis:

The two pupils [of Pheidias, Alkamenes and Agorakritos] competed against each other in making a Venus, and Alkamenes won, not because of his work but by the votes of the citizens who favoured one of their own against a foreigner. So, at this decree, Agorakritos is said to have sold his statue so that it might not remain in Athens, and called it Nemesis. It was set up at Rhamnous, a village in Attika, and Marcus Varro preferred it to all other statues.⁴³

That the cult statue of Nemesis should have found its way to Rhamnous as an expression of the sculptor's resentment is perhaps too appropriate to be true; Karanastassi suggests that the story reflects a late antique view that the statue better accords with Aphrodite's iconography than with that of Nemesis as it had developed by Pliny's time.⁴⁴ The statue's previous incarnation is also mentioned rather confusedly by Photios: Nemesis "in the form of Aphrodite" was set up by Erechtheus "as she was his mother" (a genealogy not otherwise attested), and "she was named Nemesis and reigned at Rhamnous".⁴⁵ Further obfuscation is added by Solinus' assertion that Rhamnous had "a Pheidian statue of Diana", but he may simply have misread his Pliny, the source for most of his work.⁴⁶

Stories of the statue having been designed as an Aphrodite are obviously relevant to an examination of its iconography: how much does a Nemesis look like an Aphrodite? Our mythological sources have only described Nemesis as "fair of form" (Hes. *Op.* 198) and able to change her shape — not a great deal to go on. We have no artistic representations pre-dating the Rhamnous statue, which may well have had to set a precedent. Although only fragments of the actual statue and its base survive, we have enough information from written descriptions and Roman copies of the statue to

⁴² Karanastassi et al. 1992, 734; Despinis 1971 (see 1-3 on the literary sources, 111-210 on Agorakritos and his circle).

⁴³ Pliny the Elder *NH* 36.4.17: *certavere autem inter se ambo discipuli Venere facienda vicitque Alkamenes non opere, sed civitatis suffragiis contra peregrinum suo faventis. quare Agoracritus ea lege signum suum vendidisse traditur, ne Athenis esset, et apellasse Nemesin. id positum est Rhamnunte pago Atticae, quod M. Varro omnibus signis praetulit.*

⁴⁴ Karanastassi, etc, 1992, 734.

⁴⁵ Photios *Lexicon* s.v. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις: αὕτη πρῶτον ἀφίδρυτο ἐν Ἀφροδίτης σχήματι διὸ καὶ κλάδον εἶχε μηλέας, ιδρύσατο δ' αὐτὴν Ἐρεχθεὺς, μητέρα ἑαυτοῦ οὖσαν, ὀνομαζομένην δὲ Νέμεσιν καὶ βασιλεύσασαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. A link between Nemesis and Aphrodite might be seen in Pausanias' description of Patrai, Achaia: "Not far from the theatre is a shrine of Nemesis and another of Aphrodite, with cult statues of great size in white stone." (7.20.9). See above n.22 for Aphrodite's involvement in the rape of Nemesis.

⁴⁶ *Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium* 7.26. Solinus also mentions the sanctuary of Amphiaraios, which was for a long time thought to be a confused reference to the sanctuary at nearby Oropos (on which see Paus. 1.34.1-2); Pouilloux 1956, 93.

reconstruct the original with some confidence (FIGS. 11-12).⁴⁷ From Zenobios we learn that the statue was ten cubits high, monolithic, and held an apple branch in her hand, which attribute Photios explains as a left-over from the statue's time as an Aphrodite.⁴⁸ Further details are supplied by Pausanias: "... on her head is a crown with deer and small images of Victory; in her left hand she has an apple branch, in the right a *phiale*, on which Ethiopians are represented..."⁴⁹ The apple branch and deer are often cited as indications that the Rhamnousian Nemesis was originally some sort of "nature deity" but it is difficult to see how the Victories and Ethiopians would fit into such a reading.⁵⁰ It seems rather more likely that a message about Athens' power over distant barbarians is being conveyed, but since even Pausanias was at a loss to explain the significance of the Ethiopians, despite a lengthy aside on the subject, arguments about interpretation are likely to remain inconclusive.⁵¹ Pausanias' account continues with a description of the figures depicted on the statue's base: "Helen being brought from Nemesis to Leda's breast", along with various members of the families of Tyndareos and Atreus (1.33.7). This second representation of Nemesis is identifiable amongst the extant fragments of the base, but little more can be said of her than that she is dressed in chiton and himation, like the statue above (FIGS. 13-14).⁵²

Essentially, then, the Rhamnousian Nemesis looks much like any other female figure of the mid-late fifth century, marked out as divine by her *phiale* as well as by her cult context. This makes her comparable with representations of other personifications at this period, who, as already noted, are all standard female figures, not usually

⁴⁷ Fragmentary head: London BM 460. Roman copies: Copenhagen Glyptothek 2086, Athens NM 3949.

⁴⁸ Zenobios 5.82: ἐν Ῥαμνοῦντι Νεμέσεως ἵδρυται ἄγαλμα δεκάπηχυ, ὅλολιθον, ἔργον Φειδίου, ἔχει δὲ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ μηλέας κλάδον. Photios as above, n.45. Despinis' reconstruction of the statue has shown that it was indeed carved from a single block of Parian marble. See below n.63 on the meaning of μῆλον.

⁴⁹ Paus. 1.33.3: τῇ κεφαλῇ δὲ ἔπεστι τῆς θεοῦ στέφανος ἐλάφους ἔχων καὶ Νίκης ἀγάλματα οὐ μεγάλα· ταῖς δὲ χερσὶν ἔχει τῇ μὲν κλάδον μηλέας, τῇ δεξιᾷ δὲ φιάλην, Αἰθίοπες δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ φιάλῃ πεποίηται.

⁵⁰ Dietrich (1965, 157-73) is the strongest advocate of Nemesis as "vegetation deity"; cf. Petrakos' characterisation of Nemesis (above p.82). Laroche (1949, 106) is succinct in his refutation of such hypotheses: "tout le complexe religieux de Némésis est d'origine spéculative. Pas un seule indice ne décèle l'origine 'naturiste' de la divinité." On the application of the "fertility paradigm" to Eirene, see below pp.194-5.

⁵¹ Nikai and Ethiopians: Fisher 1992, 503 n.47.

⁵² See Shapiro Lapatin 1992 for identification of the figures and a discussion of their significance. He makes a good case for the fourth female figure, to the right of Nemesis (no.9), being identified as Klytaimnestra, not only Helen's sister, but surely the most infamous wrecker of vengeance in Greek tradition.

distinguished by attributes or any peculiarity of dress.⁵³ Nemesis' one possibly distinctive feature is the apple branch. Photios' association of the apple branch with Aphrodite has a certain amount to recommend it, as the fruit at least is obviously connected with her by the Judgement of Paris story.⁵⁴ But the theory of course depends on acceptance of the story of the statue's strange history; and if the apple branch had had significance as part of the design for an Aphrodite, surely the obvious thing to do would have been to remove it to mark the statue's change of identity.⁵⁵

Nemesis' statue brings us to the political context in which her cult flourished. Several epigrams in the *Planudean Appendix* purport to belong to the statue, associating Nemesis with the Athenian victory at nearby Marathon, Parmenion's being entitled "On the Nemesis of the Athenians":

I, the stone which the Medes hoped would be their trophy-bearer, was opportunely changed in shape into Nemesis, the goddess justly established on the shores of Rhamnous, as a witness to Attika's victory and skill.⁵⁶

Pausanias tells the same story in more pedestrian style, characterising Nemesis as "the most implacable of the gods towards hybristic men":

It seems that the wrath of this goddess fell upon the barbarians' Marathon landing; thinking contemptuously that nothing could stop them from taking Athens, they brought a block of Parian marble for the making of a trophy for their achievements. Pheidias made this block into a statue of Nemesis...⁵⁷

The story is of course far too neat to be true, but entirely consonant with a general perception of Persian arrogance and its inevitable punishment.⁵⁸ Aelius Aristides even

⁵³ Above p.102.

⁵⁴ A fruit tree of some sort appears in connection with Aphrodite and her retinue of personifications on a London pyxis, being picked by Hygieia (below p.175, FIG. 34). See *LIMC* II, s.v. Aphrodite 742* for a late Hellenistic bronze of Aphrodite holding an apple (New York Met. Mus. 1972.18.96).

⁵⁵ Alternatively, could a very tenuous connection be made between Nemesis and the golden apples of the Hesperides, since Hesiod's genealogy includes the Hesperides among the children of Night, making specific mention of their apple trees (*Theog.* 215-6)?

⁵⁶ *AP* 16.222 (first century BC): Μήδοις ἐλπισθεῖσα τροπαιοφόρος λίθος εἶναι,/ ἡλλάχθην μορφήν καίριον εἰς Νέμεσιν,/ ἔνδικος ἰδρυνθεῖσα θεὰ Ῥαμνοῦντος ἐπ' ὄχθαις/ νίκης καὶ σοφίης Ἀτθίδι μαρτύριον. Cf. 16.221, 263.

⁵⁷ Paus. 1.33.2-3: ...ἡ θεῶν μάλιστα ἀνθρώποις ὑβρισταῖς ἐστὶν ἀπαραίτητος. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀποβάσιν ἐς Μαραθῶνα τῶν βαρβάρων ἀπαντῆσαι μήνιμα ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ ταύτης· καταφρονήσαντες γὰρ <μηδέν> σφισιν ἐμποδὼν εἶναι τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐλεῖν, λίθον Πάριον ὡς ἐπ' ἐξειργασμένοις ἦγον ἐς τροπαίου ποίησιν. τοῦτον Φειδίας τὸν λίθον εἰργάσατο ἄγαλμα μὲν εἶναι Νεμέσεως...

⁵⁸ Cf. the fate of the Spartans who set off on campaign against the Arcadians equipped with fetters to enslave them, only to be enslaved themselves (Hdt. 1.66).

comments on the coincidence that the over-confident Persians should land near the territory of the very goddess who specialises in punishing the hybrisitic:

And the first force from Asia passed through the islands and landed at Marathon, rightly drawn by the nature of the place to pay the penalty for what they had plotted against the Greeks.⁵⁹

This connection with the battle of Marathon has led many commentators to suggest that Nemesis' cult was founded in celebration of the "revenge" wreaked upon the overweening Persians in 490.⁶⁰ Since the discovery of earlier material at the site, however, the theory has had to be modified, as in Petrakos' idea that Marathon caused a change in the aspect of Nemesis which was emphasised, or Miles' more practical suggestion that Marathon merely elevated the cult's status.⁶¹ The cult at Rhamnous is one of the few instances of an association between *nemesis* and *hybris* which Fisher allows, though he does not give it as much weight as it perhaps deserves; he sees Nemesis' earlier incarnation there as the more personal mother-of-Helen figure, the Trojan War association providing a nice link with her fifth-century role as symbol of divine anger and punisher of Persian *hybris*.⁶² This last solution comes nearest to answering the problem of Nemesis' "abstractness", and may be supported by further consideration of the political context for the the creation of Nemesis' temple and cult statue. The Marathon connection might, incidentally, explain the cult statue's apple branch, since the apple is said to come from Persia,⁶³ or, as the battle took place in late

⁵⁹ *Panathenaikos* 13: ἡ τ' ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας πρώτη διαβᾶσα δύναμις διὰ τῶν νήσων προσέσχευεν εἰς Μαραθῶνα, καλῶς ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀχθεῖσα τοῦ τόπου πρὸς τὸ δοῦναι δίκην ᾧν ἐπεβούλευσε τοῖς Ἕλλησιν.

⁶⁰ The delay in erecting a temple and cult statue would fit with the Oath of Plataia, according to which the ruins of sanctuaries destroyed by the Persians should be left as memorials of the barbarians' *asebeia*: Diod. Sik. 11.29.2, Lyk. 1.81. On the authenticity of the oath and its effects, see Mark 1993, 98-104. See Thomas (1989, 223-6) on Marathon as the epitome of the Persian Wars and Athenian imperial power, from at least the last quarter of the fifth century.

⁶¹ Foundation of cult post-Marathon: Pouilloux (1954, 57-8 and n.7); Vos (1956, 78). Petrakos 1991, 7; Miles 1989, 138-9. Parker (1996, 154) wants to retain Dinsmoor's association of Nemesis' temple with the "programme" which also produced the temples of Poseidon at Sounion, Ares at Acharnai and Hephaistos in the Athenian agora; the message of this programme, that Athens "had inflicted on the Persians a bitter nemesis", would explain the "unusual honour" bestowed on "a local goddess" at Rhamnous. Cf. John Wilkins' arguments on the *Herakleidai* (430 BC?) and cults of Makaria, Herakles and Eurystheus in the Tetrapolis (1993, xxvii).

⁶² Fisher 1993, 503 and n.47; cf. 256-63 and 367-85 on the kind of *hybris* ascribed to the Persians in Aischylos' *Persians* and Herodotos.

⁶³ Athenaios' diners discuss all kinds of fruit, including apples (3.80e-82e). The word μῆλον is used in combination with various qualifications to designate damsons (2.49d-50a), quinces (3.81a, d-f), peaches ("Persian apples", 3.82f-83a), but on its own generally seems to mean apple. One of the diners comments on the confusion of apples and lemons,

summer when apple trees would be fruiting, the apple might perhaps have been associated with the victory in the way that the poppy was with Flanders.⁶⁴

The theme of Aelius' speech, probably delivered at the Panathenaia of AD 155, is the Athenians' generosity and self-sacrifice, of which Marathon is the obvious classic example, and this may provide a clue to the question of why Rhamnous/Nemesis received so much interest in the late 430s-20s. There is nothing in the sanctuary's earlier history to indicate that it was of more than local importance, but the amount of money spent on the refurbishments would suggest more than local deme resources.⁶⁵ Arguing for a date for the temple in the mid-420s, Miles adduces the general religious fervour evident from the archaeological record of the period, which she suggests was inspired in part by outbreaks of the plague in the early years of the decade.⁶⁶ Certainly a general enthusiasm for building and repairing shrines provides a propitious climate, although Nemesis is not an obvious goddess to invoke against the plague.⁶⁷ Even if we follow the more traditional dating of the temple to just before the War, there is some agreement that the cult statue and its base were not completed until some time in the 420s, bringing into play the same political context.⁶⁸ An important feature of Marathon is that the Spartans were absent, too busy celebrating the Karneia to come to

which has given rise to the myth of the "golden" apples of the Hesperides (3.83.b-84d). Apples come from Euboia (2.27f), are more specifically called "Delphic *mêla*" (3.80e), were discovered by Dionysos (3.82d), come from the Persian king (3.84a-b, quoting Antiphanes' *Boiotian Women*). Cf. the Persian *Melophoroi*, a thousand men selected from among the Immortals to serve as the king's bodyguard, whose spears had golden apples on their butts (12.514b). Thanks to John Wilkins for this point.

⁶⁴ Alan Griffiths' idea.

⁶⁵ Though the evidence is not conclusive: see Miles (1989, 234 and n.192) on the financial independence or otherwise of the Rhamnous cult from Athens. Whitehead (1986, 160) comments on the 450-40 accounts (above n.35) that the total resources available are not demonstrably "grossly incommensurate" with a deme of its size; cf. Parker 1996, 25-6 and n.56.

⁶⁶ Miles 1989, 221-35. Cf. restoration work on the Altar of the Twelve Gods in the 420s and the introduction of the cults of Asklepios and Hygieia in 420/19 BC. On building projects of the war period, see Boersma 1970, 82-96. On "divine vengeance and disease", see Parker 1983, 235-56.

⁶⁷ Unless she is seen as the gods' representative, instrument of their punishment, in the form of the plague, for some unidentified offence. Cf. mythical instances of plagues resulting from neglect of proper attentions to, or offences against, the gods; see below pp.131-4 on Pausanias' aition for the worship of Peitho at Sikyon. Thanks to Gideon Nisbet for this suggestion. On "divine vengeance and disease", see Parker 1983, 235-56.

⁶⁸ Despinis (1971) dates the statue to c.430, with work on the base continuing to c.420; the discrepancy of 10 years in date, and the resulting technical difficulties of installing the statue, are addressed by Petrakos 1986. Despinis is apparently convinced by Miles' reassessment of the date of the temple, and willing to date the installation of both statue and base to a single date within the years 430-20 (Miles 1989, 226-7, n.153).

the allies' assistance: a memorial to Athens' victory over the barbarians famously achieved *without the Spartans* would be a suitable morale-booster in the face of repeated Spartan invasions of Attika in the early 420s.⁶⁹ At a more practical level, the fortress of Rhamnous commands a strategically useful position, offering a safe harbour on an otherwise largely inhospitable coast connecting up with a land route to inland Attika.⁷⁰ This was to be of crucial importance from 412/11 after the Spartan capture of Dekeleia and Oropos, when Rhamnous offered the only safe route for the importation of corn supplies from Euboia. Although little can be said for certain of Rhamnous' role earlier in the War, it seems too much of a coincidence that the deme's major sanctuary should have received so much attention c.430.⁷¹ The building of the new temple, I would suggest, not only honoured a goddess who had proved so efficacious against invaders in the past, but also provided an earnest of Athens' commitment to Rhamnous at a time when Attic solidarity was particularly needed.

RHAMNOUS, ATHENS AND THE NEMESIA

If such strong links with Athens are to be supposed, what evidence is there for the worship of Nemesis by the Athenians? The title "On the Nemesis of the Athenians" which heads two of the Hellenistic epigrams already mentioned on the Rhamnous statue suggests a firm link at least in the minds of the epigrammatists, while a Roman copy of the Rhamnous statue and one just of its head have been found in Athens.⁷² Other indications of Nemesis' cult in Athens are not necessarily formally linked to Rhamnous, as we shall see, though it would be difficult not to make some sort of association. For the cult's observance before the Hellenistic period, however, we have only a few literary references and just one securely identified appearance in vase-painting.

Our only fifth-century representation of Nemesis other than the statue and base at Rhamnous is on the Berlin amphoriskos, name-vase of the Heimarmene Painter,

⁶⁹ On the Karneia and Marathon, see Burkert 1985a, 234; cf. Parker 1989, 155-62 on Spartan religion and approach to warfare.

⁷⁰ On Rhamnous' geographical advantages, see Pouilloux 1954, 17-22.

⁷¹ See Pouilloux 1954, 55-66.

⁷² Whole statue, Athens NM 3949; head, Agora S 1055 (*LIMC* s.v. "Nemesis" 2d and h).

which depicts the “Persuasion of Helen” (FIG. 16).⁷³ In the central scene a pensive Helen sits on Aphrodite’s lap, attended by Peitho, while Himeros seems to be giving Paris advice. Inscriptions identify the figure on the far left as Nemesis, the second from the right as Heimarmene, another “fate” character. Nemesis has one arm around her companion, the other pointing to the main scene. Only two letters of inscription by her companion are legible, _Y_E, but Tyche would be an obvious candidate; Heimarmene’s companion is unidentified. Nemesis’ presence could be explained by her role as Helen’s mother, but the composition, with the four personifications framing the central mythological scene, invites an allegorical reading: Heimarmene represents the past, fate already ordained, Tyche would be the present, the fateful meeting now taking place, while Nemesis points to the future and the dire consequences of that meeting. Such a use of personified figures is quite unprecedented, and the vase has been much discussed. A clue can perhaps be found in its date of around 430 BC: although Nemesis had not previously been included in representations of her daughter’s abduction, contemporary interest in her cult at Rhamnous might have prompted her introduction into the scene, and the appropriateness of her abstract meaning could then have suggested the inclusion of the other allegorical figures.⁷⁴ By analogy with this scene it has been suggested that two figures on the more or less contemporary *ôon* from the Stathatos collection in Athens could be Nemesis and Tyche.⁷⁵ The whole scene represents a game being played by two seated females, the one on the right presumably being Aphrodite, as she has Erôs leaning on her knee; the game is identified as “morra” by Beazley and Ghali-Kahil. Various figures look on, including a youth wearing the cloak and *petasos* of a newly arrived traveller. The scene fits with the Helen and Paris iconography established by Ghali-Kahil, although the game is unprecedented, and the unusual egg-shape certainly lends credibility to the idea that Nemesis should be involved, but without inscriptions the identification has to remain speculative.

⁷³ Amphoriskos, Heimarmene Painter, c.430, Berlin 30036; *ARV*² 1173,1; Shapiro 1993 no.129. See Shapiro (1986, 11-14 and 1993, 192-5) for detailed discussions of the vase; he suggests that the fourth figure might be Themis.

⁷⁴ Heimarmene is not otherwise personified in extant art or literature, and this is our earliest attestation of the noun. See further below pp.150-1 on the Persuasion of Helen.

⁷⁵ *ARV*² 1257,2. Attributed to the Eretria Painter by Metzger 1944, though Beazley disagrees. Reputedly found in the same grave as another *ôon*, showing a youth carrying off a woman in a chariot (*ARV*² 1256, 1). Identification of Nemesis and Tyche: Ghali-Kahil 1955 67, n.1.

Kratinos' *Nemesis* is the one piece of literature on Nemesis more or less contemporary with the temple; as it seems to have parodied Perikles' attempts to have his son by Aspasia made a citizen, it seems likely that it dates from before his death in 429, and Godolphin argues for production in 431.⁷⁶ The play fits with the Rhamnous statue base in including Leda, Nemesis and Helen, and with the rape story in making much of the bird element.⁷⁷ The egg could apparently be seen on stage, and this may be reflected in a dozen or so Attic vases of the last third of the fifth century which show a large white egg on an altar, while Leda looks on, often accompanied by Tyndareos and the Dioskouroi (FIG. 15);⁷⁸ a similar scene appears on some Campanian and Apulian vases of the fourth century, sometimes with Helen actually emerging from the egg.⁷⁹ While it is not certain that the vase-paintings are representations of Kratinos' play, and none feature Nemesis herself, they do at least suggest a strong interest in the version of Helen's birth which makes Leda only her foster-mother, so giving Attika a greater stake in the Trojan War.⁸⁰ It is very tempting to link the production of Kratinos' play, as well as the vases, with the re-furbishing of the sanctuary at Rhamnous, which would give topicality to the choice of this myth for the entertainment of the demos of Athens. Furthermore, if the play does belong to the first years of the Peloponnesian War, it is easy to see how a story which makes Sparta's most famous heroine actually Attic might appeal to its audience.⁸¹

Similarly, the practical importance of Rhamnous as a supply-route from c.412 might lie behind Euripides' choice of Nemesis as a suitable deity for Antigone to invoke in the *Phoenician Women*, which was produced in the early years of the

⁷⁶ PCG IV, Cratinus 114-27; see fr.125 and p.179 on the date; Godolphin 1931. See Plut. *Per.* 24 on Perikles, Aspasia and the comic poets. Thanks to John Wilkins for information on Kratinos.

⁷⁷ Zeus has been metamorphosed into a bird (fr.114); someone tells Leda she must sit on the egg so that it will hatch (fr.115).

⁷⁸ Leda finds the egg on an altar: e.g. Attic bell-krater by Polion, 420 BC, Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum 78.247; Carpenter 1991, 198-9, fig. 295; Schefold 1981, fig. 342.

⁷⁹ Taplin (1993, 82-3) distinguishes between "serious" representations of scenes from tragedy or comedy and "comic" versions, what he calls "paraiconography". "Serious" version of Helen emerging from the egg: Paestan neck-amphora by Python, c.350 BC, Paestum 21370; Taplin 1993, fig. 19.114. "Paraiconographic" version: Apulian phlyax-krater, c.350 BC, Bari 3899; Schefold 1981, fig. 346. See Shapiro 1995 for criticism of Taplin's "overly subtle" approach. On South Italian vase-painting and the Attic theatre, see above p.40 n.102.

⁸⁰ Schefold 1981, 242-8. Other comedies based around the egg story: Aristophanes' *Daidalos* and probably Euboulos' *Lakones* or *Leda* (see Hunter 1983).

⁸¹ Cf. Fisher (1994, 362-4) on the Athenian adoption of Tyrtaios in the fourth century.

Dekeleian war. From the city walls the *paidagogos* identifies the Argive heroes besieging Thebes, among whom is Kapaneus, “uttering hybristic threats on this city”. Antigone’s prayer — “Nemesis and deep-booming thunders of Zeus, and blazing light of thunderbolts, you put to sleep the overbearing big-talk” — could be seen as a reflection of Athenian appeals to the goddess to defend their city against the hard-pressing Spartans.⁸² In the only other instance in Attic tragedy where *nemesis* is unambiguously associated with *hybris*, Sophokles’ Elektra invokes Nemesis in support of Orestes, supposedly dead because of Klytaimnestra’s *hybris*: “Hear me, Nemesis of the newly dead man.”⁸³ Exactly what Nemesis’ relationship is to the dead is unclear, whether she is envisaged as having a specific role as avenger of the dead, or is being appealed to more generally as an upholder of justice. Some such association with justice for the dead is suggested by a fragment of Aischylos, where Hermes (?) tells Achilles that the dead themselves feel neither good nor evil done to them, but “our Nemesis is mightier, and Dike avenges the dead man’s grudge”.⁸⁴

In the fourth century this association between Nemesis and the dead may be attested by a passage in Demosthenes’ *Against Spoudias*, delivered by an unnamed plaintiff:

Finally, although my wife advanced a hundred drachmai of silver and spent it on her father’s behalf on the Nemesia, the defendant will not contribute his share even of this...⁸⁵

Plaintiff and defendant are married to two sisters, whose father Polyeuktos has recently died, without a male heir, and the plaintiff is suing for various monies owed him by the estate, apparently being withheld by Spoudias. Amongst other minor infamies, Spoudias and his wife have even failed to pay their share towards τὰ νεμέσια. The

⁸² Eur. *Phoin.* 182-4: Νέμεσι καὶ Διὸς βαρύβρομοι βρονταί,/ κεραυνῶν τε φῶς αἰθαλόεν, σὺ τοι/ μεγαλαγορίαν ὑπεράνορα κοιμίζεις. See Fisher 1992, 427-8: “The appropriateness of *nemesis* as a respondent to Capaneus’ threats is probably related to her capacity... to react angrily to dangerously boastful or over-confident utterances (not all of which need be classified as constituting *hybris*).” An entry in the *Suda* (s.v. Νέμεσις) would suggest this prayer was parodied by Aristophanes: Ἀριστοφάνης· ἰὼ Νέμεσι, βαρύβρομοί τε βρονταί.

⁸³ Soph. *El.* 792: Ἀκουε, Νέμεσι τοῦ θανόντος ἀρτίως.

⁸⁴ Aisch. fr.244 Mette: καὶ τοὺς θανόντας εἰ θέλεις εὐεργετεῖν/ εἴτ’ οὖν κακουργεῖν, ἀμφιδεξίως ἔχει/ τῷ μήτε χαίρειν μήτε λυπεῖσθαι φθιτούς./ ἡμῶν γε μέντοι Νέμεσις ἐσθ’ ὑπερτέρα,/ καὶ τοῦ θανόντος ἡ Δίκη πράσσει κότον. Fisher (1992, 300-01) comments on the difficulties of both passages.

⁸⁵ Demosth. *Or.* 41.11: τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον εἰσενεγκούσης τῆς ἐμῆς γυναικὸς εἰς τὰ νεμέσια τῷ πατρὶ μὲν ἀργυρίου καὶ προαναλωσάσης, οὐδὲ ταύτης ἀξιοῖ συμβαλέσεσθαι τὸ μέρος... On the assertion in the Loeb footnote to this passage that the Nemeseia was held on the 5th Boedromion, see Petrakos 1992, 33.

context suggests that this should be understood as some sort of funerary cult, perhaps an annual remembrance of the dead, and this is the interpretation offered by the *Suda*, which cites this passage in its commentary on Nemesis' festival: "The Nemesia is a certain festival held for the dead, since Nemesis is assigned to the dead".⁸⁶ Parker suggests that the Demosthenes may be a textual corruption for *Genesia*, the various lexicographical notices "simply guesses based on this single passage", but given our other evidence for Nemesis' association with the dead at Athens the possibility of a minor festival should perhaps not be entirely ruled out.⁸⁷ One of three Roman-period altars that have been found in Athens bearing Nemesis' name was in the Kerameikos, dedicated to "Nemesis the listening goddess".⁸⁸ Nemesis appears in at least one Hellenistic epitaph, and is explicitly associated with Underworld "avengers" in a rather obscure passage at the end of a late first century BC paraphrase of Plato's *Timaios*: "In the second cycle Nemesis, together with the avenging and the chthonic daimones, watchers over human affairs, has determined all of these things; to them the god who is ruler of all entrusted the government of the universe..."⁸⁹

The one piece of evidence which would seem to undermine the characterisation of Nemesis at Athens as a deity of the dead is a priest-seat inscription from the Theatre of Dionysos reserving a place for "the priest of Heavenly Nemesis".⁹⁰ Not only the epithet Ourania, however, but also the gender of her attendant would suggest that this should be understood as a cult quite distinct from the Nemesis of Rhamnous, who, as we have seen, was served by a priestess.⁹¹ And indeed, further back in the theatre part

⁸⁶ *Suda* s.v. Νεμέσια· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Σπουδίου. μήποτε ἑορτή τις Νεμέσεως, καθ' ἣν τοῖς κατοικομένοις ἐπετέλουν τὰ νομιζόμενα. Νεμέσια οὖν ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς νεκροῖς γινομένη πανήγυρις, ἐπεὶ ἡ νέμεσις ἐπὶ τῶν νεκρῶν τέτακται. Garland (1994, 59) suggests that the festival "was probably intended to placate the angry dead".

⁸⁷ Parker 1996, 246-7 n.101.

⁸⁸ Kerameikos altar (from west peribolos), *IG II² 4865*: Νεμέσε[ι]/ θεᾷ ἐπηκ[ό]/-ωι εὐχὴν / [ἀν]έθηκ[εν]... Altar near Theatre of Dionysos: *IG II² 4747*. Altar in Agora I 4790 + *IG II² 4817a* (Raubitschek, *Hesperia* 12, 1943, pp.87-8, no.26).

⁸⁹ *AP*. 7.358: μή σε λάθοι Νέμεσις. <Timaios of Locri>, *De Anima Mundi et Natura* 87-8, Tobin: "Ἀπαντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐν δευτέρᾳ περιόδῳ ἡ Νέμεσις συνδιέκρινε σὺν δαίμοσι παλαμναίοις χθονίοις τε, τοῖς ἐπόπταις τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων, οἷς ὁ πάντων ἀγεμὼν θεὸς ἐπέτρεψε διοίκησιν κόσμου... Nemesis' only appearance in Plato himself is in the *Laws*, where she is "overseer" of children's behaviour towards their parents and "messenger of Justice" (717d). For Nemesis as "watcher-over" of affairs on earth, cf. *Suda* s.v. Νέμεσις, and the *Orphic Hymn* 61.2: πανδερκῆς, ἑσορῶσα βίον θνητῶν πολυφύλων. Farnell (1896-1909, II 487) derives Artemis' cult title *Oupis* from ὀπίζεσθαι, which he sees as one of many links between Artemis and Nemesis — hence his hypothesis that Nemesis began life as an epithet.

⁹⁰ Priest-seat, *IG II² 5070*: ἱερέως Οὐρανίας Νεμέσεως.

⁹¹ Maaß 1972, 134. Rhamnousian priestesses: above pp.79-80 and nn.73-5.

of an inscription can just be made out “... in Rham[nous]”, which is may well be the place for the priestess of “the goddess in Rhamnous”, as Nemesis seems to have become known in Hellenistic literature.⁹²

Whether or not there was an Athenian Nemesis, we certainly have evidence for a “Great Nemesis” at Rhamnous in the late fourth and third centuries, a period when the strategic position of Rhamnous and the military links with Athens, already noted for the fifth century, come to the fore. Such links may have been growing in strength over the first half of the fourth century, but would have been confirmed with the formalisation of military training for 18-20 year olds in the mid-330s, whereby all ephebes were stationed for a year in barracks at Piraeus, followed by a year in one of the other Attic forts.⁹³ That the sanctuary at Rhamnous would have hosted a regular festival in honour of its main goddess seems likely *a priori*, but it is with the late fourth-century garrison that we first have evidence for it. A dedication of 333/2 inscribed on the round base of a ephebic herm, found below the east retaining wall of the sanctuary, celebrates a victory in a contest one would assume took place in a festival context:

The *sophronistes* Perik[... of Anagyr]ous and the gymnasiarchs of the ephebes [of the tribe Ere]chtheis dedicated this having been victorious in the torch-race in the archonship of Nikokrates, [...]andros Tim[...] of Euonymon and Charikles son of Aleximenes from Pergase...⁹⁴

The demotics confirm that the gymnasiarchs are of the tribe Erechtheis, and 46 names of the ephebic victors follow. Further evidence for the torch-race is provided by two fragmentary votive reliefs from the sanctuary, also datable to the 330s, the better-preserved of the two clearly showing the procession of the team after the race towards three goddesses (FIG. 17). The first of these must be Victory, as she is winged; the

⁹² Sixteen rows back, in the third *kerkis* from the centre on the right, *IG II² 5143*: ... ἐν Ῥαμ[νοῦντι].

⁹³ Eleusis, Rhamnous, Phyle, and perhaps Sounion and Aphidna. Some form of this institution had probably been in place from the first half of the century, but it was now given public support and made compulsory: Humphreys 1985, 206-9; Parker 1996, 253-4; Habicht 1997, 16-17.

⁹⁴ Herm: Athens NM 313. *IG II² 3105* (Pouilloux 1954, 2 *bis*) + *SEG XXXI 162*: [ὁ σωφ]ρονιστῆς Περικ[.....]Ἀναγυρ]άσιος / [καὶ οἱ τῆς Ἐρε]χθείδος ἐφήβων γ[υμ]νασίαρχοι ἀνέθεσαν / [οἱ ἐπὶ] Νικοκράτους ἄρχοντος λαμπάδι νικήσαντες / [...ανδρος Τιμ[...]] Εὐωνυμεύς, Χαρικλῆς Ἀλεξιμένου Περγασῆθεν. Parker (1996, 246 and 254 n.126) suggests that the games might be an innovation of this Lykourgan period. Cf. *IG II² 1496.93* (below p.189 n.29) for the sacrifice to Eirene in Nikokrates' archonship.

remaining pair are likely to be Nemesis and Themis, given the relief's provenance, although there is nothing to confirm the identification.⁹⁵

Quite explicit testimony of a festival for Nemesis, including games, is provided in the mid-third century by the inscription recently found in a well outside the east gate of the fortress. This is a decree of c.255 BC proposing that the Macedonian king Antigonos (Gonatas) be worshipped by the Rhamnousians, following the example of the people of Athens:

Elpinikos son of Mnesippos, of Rhamnous, proposed: since Antigonos (Gonatas), King and Saviour of the people, continues doing good services to the people of Athens, and because of these the people have paid him godlike honours, for good fortune, the Rhamnousians have decided to sacrifice to him on the 19th Hekatombaion, and to crown him at the athletic contests of the Great Nemesia, and to raise resources for the sacrifice from their fellow-demesmen, their commercial profit; the demarch and the treasurer in office at the time should have responsibility for the sacrifice; and this decree should be inscribed on a stone stele and set up beside the altar of king Antigonos...⁹⁶

Not only do we have notice here of the Great Nemesia's existence, but also of the festival's date in early July, the inclusion of athletic contests, and details of the financial management of the sacrifice involved. The proposer of this motion is one Elpinikos son of Mnesippos, who also proposes a decree of 236/5 BC, honouring one Dikaiarchos of Thria:

... He also donated victims for the sacrifice of the Nemesia and the king from his own resources, after the sacrifices had been neglected because of the war, so that matters concerning the goddess of the Rhamnousians might go well...⁹⁷

The king is by now Demetrios II, the war which has been interrupting the sacrifices the "war of Demetrios" of the early 230s; presumably it is the financial exigencies of war

⁹⁵ London BM 1953.5-30.1+ Rhamnous 530 (cf. Rhamnous 531). See Palagia and Lewis 1989 on the ephebic dedication and the reliefs, and Ashmole 1962 for an earlier attempt to identify the goddesses. *Contra* Palagia and Lewis' identification of the figure on the far left of the group as Themis, Karanastassi (1997, no.24) points to the central figure's sceptre as making her a better candidate.

⁹⁶ Petrakos 1992, 31-4, no.15, pl.12b: [Ἐ]λπίνικος Μνησίππου Ῥαμνούσιος/ εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγο-/ς καὶ σωτὴρ τοῦ δήμου, διατελεῖ εὖερ-/ (γ)ετῶν τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων κ[α]-/ι διὰ ταῦτα αὐτὸν ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν/ τιμαῖς ἰσοθέοις, τύχει ἀγαθεῖ, δεδόχθαι/ [Ῥ]αμνουσίοις θύειν αὐτῷ τεῖ ἐνάτει ἐπὶ/ δέκα τοῦ ἑκατονβαιῶνος, τῶν μεγάλ-/ων Νεμεσίων τῷ γυμνικῷ ἀγῶνι/ καὶ στεφανηφορεῖν, πόρον δὲ ὑπάρχ[ε-/ιν] τοῖς δημόταις εἰς τὴν θυσίαν ἢ ὅ γε-/νό]μενον αὐτοῖς ἀγοραστικόν· ἤης θυ-/σίας ἐπιμελίσθαι τὸν δήμ[αρχον κ-/α]ι τὸν ταμίαν τὸν ἀεὶ καθίστάμε-/νον· ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε [τὸ ψήφισμα/ ἐν στήλει λιθί]νει καὶ στήσθαι οὗ/ ἂν δοκῇ τῷ β(α)σιλεῖ Ἀντιγόνωι]...

⁹⁷ SEG XXV 155 (Pouilloux 1954, no.15; Moretti 1967, no.29; Whitehead 1986, 447 no.322.), ll.27-30: ... ἔδωκεν δὲ καὶ ἱερεῖα εἰς τὴν θυ-/σίαν τῶν Νεμεσίων καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, ἐγλειπου-/ [σ]ῶν τῶν θυσιῶν διὰ τὸν πόλεμον, ὅπως ἔχει καλῶς τὰ πρὸς / [τ]ὰς θεὰς Ῥαμνουσίοις...

which have necessitated the private donation in place of the public finance suggested by the earlier decree. Both inscriptions are fascinating documents for the history of Attica under Macedonian rule, in particular for the combining of ruler cult with more traditional religious practices, but the later decree is also interesting for a formula suggesting a wide-based decision-making body, encompassing not only the Rhamnousians, but also “the other Athenians, all those living in Rhamnous” (Il.30-2), which would suggest a thorough integration of garrison and deme, as well as underlining the strong links between Rhamnous and Athens.⁹⁸ That the Rhamnousians continued to have a keen eye for political expediency in their religious observance into the Roman period is attested by the odd fact that the temple architave bears a rededication to the newly deified empress Livia in AD 45/6:

The people to the goddess Livia, when Demostratos, son of Dionysios of Pallene, was in command of the hoplites and priest of the goddess Roma and Caesar Augustus, and Aiolon, younger son of Antipater of Phlya, was archon.⁹⁹

THE NEMESEIS OF SMYRNA

In addition to Rhamnous, the cult of Nemesis had a major centre at Smyrna in Asia Minor, where the most immediately striking feature is that the goddess has been multiplied into a pair of Nemeseis. Pausanias tells the story of the cult’s inception in the course of relating the history of Smyrna. In the early seventh century the old town was sacked and the original Aiolian inhabitants were driven out by Ionian refugees from Kolophon, in turn made homeless by Gyges of Lydia.¹⁰⁰ Several centuries later:

Alexander son of Philip founded the modern city after a vision in a dream: he was hunting on mount Pagos, and as he returned from the hunt they say he reached a sanctuary of the Nemeseis, and he came upon a spring in front of the sanctuary and a plane tree, growing over the water. While he was sleeping under the plane tree they say that the Nemeseis appeared to him and ordered him to found a city there and to bring the people of Smyrna to it, turning them out of the earlier city... So they moved willingly and now believe in two Nemeseis instead of one...¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ See Whitehead 1986, 405-6 for the variety of formulae used in Rhamnousian decrees. On the Attic cult of Antigonos Gonatas, see Habicht 1996. On the third-century political context in general, see Habicht 1997.

⁹⁹ *IG II²* 3242: ὁ δῆμος / θεᾶι Λειβία στρατηγοῦντος / [ἐπὶ] τοὺς ὀπλε[ί]τας τοῦ καὶ ἱερέως θεᾶς / [Ῥώμη]ς κ[α]ὶ Σεβασ[τ]οῦ Καίσαρος [Δημ]οστράτου / [τοῦ Διονυ]σίου Παλληνέως, ἄρχοντος δὲ / [Αἰολίωνος] τοῦ Ἀν<τι>πάτρου Φλυέ[ως] νεωτέρου. Dinsmoor 1961, 186-94; Miles 1989, 236-9.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Hdt 1.16 for the destruction of Smyrna c.600 BC.

¹⁰¹ Paus. 7.5.1: Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁ Φιλίππου τῆς ἐφ’ ἡμῶν πόλεως ἐγένετο οἰκιστὴς κατ’ ὄψιν ὀνειράτος· Ἀλέξανδρον γὰρ θηρεύοντα ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Πάγῳ, ὡς ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τῆς θήρας, ἀφικέσθαι πρὸς Νεμέσεων λέγουσιν ἱερόν, καὶ πηγῇ τε ἐπιτυχεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ πλατάνῳ πρὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, πεφυκυῖα δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος. καὶ ὑπὸ τῇ πλατάνῳ καθεύδοντι κελεύειν φασὶν αὐτῷ τὰς Νεμέσεις ἐπιφανείσας πόλιν ἐνταῦθα οἰκίζειν καὶ ἄγειν ἐς αὐτὴν Σμυρναίους

Alexander's dream is nicely illustrated on a series of Roman coins of the second and third centuries AD (FIG. 18).¹⁰² The story is rather confused, with Alexander sleeping in front of the shrine of the twin Nemeseis at a stage when they are not yet supposed to exist, but it does state explicitly that before his intervention the people of Smyrna only had the one Nemesis.

This point is overlooked by most commentators, who seem almost unanimous in assigning a cult of the two Nemeseis to the archaic period, either in the seventh century or early in the sixth, after the Lydian destruction.¹⁰³ In fact, however, the cult's pre-Hellenistic existence is attested only by Pausanias' account of Alexander's dream, and by two brief remarks he makes concerning the cult statues. In the course of a discussion of artistic representations of the Charites Pausanias mentions that "in the temple of the Nemeseis at Smyrna, above the cult statues are set up golden Charites, the work of Boupalos..."¹⁰⁴ As Boupalos was active in the mid sixth century BC, it is usually inferred from this passage that the *agalmata* of the Nemeseis and the temple which housed them must be of similar date. The exact relationship between Boupalos' Charites and the *agalmata* is, however, rather obscure: are we to imagine full-size statues raised up on plinths at a higher level than the Nemesis statues? It is not at all clear from Pausanias that Boupalos was also responsible for the Nemeseis, and I see no reason why a set of Charites should not pre-date the building in which Pausanias saw them.¹⁰⁵ An archaic date also seems at first sight to be suggested by Pausanias' comment on Agorakritos' statue at Rhamnous: "Neither this statue of Nemesis nor any other made by the ancients has wings, since not even the most holy

ἀναστήσαντα ἐκ τῆς προτέρας... οὕτω μετῴκισαντο ἐθέλονται καὶ δύο Νεμέσεις νομίζουσιν ἀντὶ μιᾶς... Cf. Prodikos' "Choice of Herakles".

¹⁰² AE, issues under Marcus Aurelius, Gordian and Philip I, Karanastassi, etc 1992, no.15*; Klose 1987, pls. 39-40, 52, 54.

¹⁰³ Schweitzer 1931, 202 (seventh century); Vos 1956, 70-1 (early sixth century); Hamdorf 1964, 35 (archaic); Kershaw 1986, ch.4 (early sixth century); Shapiro 1993, 173 (mid-sixth century). In support of his argument, Kershaw cites Theognis 1103: ὕβρις καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσε καὶ Κολοφῶνα/ καὶ Σμύρνην. πάντως, Κύρνε, καὶ ὕμ' ἀπολεῖ. This, however, is dependent upon an attribution to Theognis of a link between *hybris* and *nemesis*; see Fisher 1992, 215-6.

¹⁰⁴ Paus. 9.35.6: καὶ Σμυρναίοις τοῦτο μὲν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῶν Νεμέσεων ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων χρυσοῦ Χάριτες ἀνάκεινται, τέχνη Βουπάλου.

¹⁰⁵ Some have doubted the very existence of Boupalos' golden Charites: Karanastassi 1992, 739.

wooden idols (ἁγιώτατα ξόανα) of Smyrna have wings.”¹⁰⁶ Pausanias generally uses *xoanon* of fully figured wooden statues of gods, often with some indication that he considers the work to be “ancient”, although this, as Donohue points out, does not necessarily make them archaic; in fact, some works which he designates as *xoana* are explicitly associated with named sculptors of the Classical period.¹⁰⁷ Although we might expect Pausanias to be better informed about Smyrna, the major city of his home area, it is always possible that he himself was confused on the issue of the cult statues’ antiquity, especially if the temple did indeed contain sixth-century Charites by Boupalos.

Neither passage, then, is conclusive in making the statues archaic; if they *are* understood as so doing, they contradict Pausanias’ own story in speaking of plural Nemeseis before Alexander. In any case, we have further evidence for the cult statues with which an archaic date ill accords, in representations on coins and gems from the Roman imperial period (FIGS. 19-20).¹⁰⁸ These show a pair of Nemeseis, both holding a fold of their *himatia* in a distinctive pose and carrying the attributes of measuring rod and bridle. That these are indeed supposed to represent the cult statues is demonstrated by the Hadrianic coin (FIG. 21) which depicts a temple front with two statues inside. Such figures could hardly be archaic korai, who scarcely manage to raise their arms from their sides, and certainly never have attributes. If the statues were not archaic, we have no evidence at all for a pre-Alexandrian cult, and it is plausible that the cult was in fact an innovation which came with the founding of the new city. Nemesis only becomes relevant at Smyrna when for the first time there is the real possibility of getting vengeance for the mistreatment of a Greek city: Alexander will make the Persians pay for what the Lydians did. This would nicely parallel the situation at Rhamnous, if we accept the argument that the cult was a response to the Greek victory over the eastern barbarians.

The plurality of the Smyrna Nemeseis remains puzzling. Schweitzer adduces the influence of neighbouring cults of dual divinities in Asia Minor that go back to the

¹⁰⁶ Paus. 1.33.6: πτερὰ δ' ἔχον οὔτε τοῦτο τὸ ἄγαλμα Νεμέσεως οὔτε ἄλλο πεποιήται τῶν ἀρχαίων, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ Σμυρναίοις τὰ ἁγιώτατα ξόανα ἔχει πτερὰ.

¹⁰⁷ Donohue 1988, 140-7.

¹⁰⁸ For representations of the two Nemeseis, see Karanastassi, etc. 1992, nos. 3-29. On the Smyrnaian coins, see Klose 1987, 28-30.

second millenium;¹⁰⁹ Laroche sees the doubling as due to syncretism rather than reduplication, a joining together of the Greek Nemesis and a Mysian or Phrygian Adrasteia.¹¹⁰ Farnell and Ehrenberg emphasise the Alexander story, seeing the two Nemeseis as reflecting the two Smyrnas, old and new.¹¹¹ Price puts the Nemeseis in her category of duplications which strengthen the quality a deity represents.¹¹² Shapiro resurrects a theory rejected even by Farnell, that the duality might have its source in Hesiod's two versions of Nemesis, one apparently Bad ("an evil for mortal men"), the other definitely Good.¹¹³ The multiplying of personifications can of course also be seen in Hesiod's two Erises in the *Works and Days* (11-26), and in artistic representations of Erôs and Nike. It could be argued that such multiplying suggests an allegorical understanding of the characters concerned: certainly Hesiod's good and bad Strifes show a rationalising approach, and the plurality of Victories or Loves brings the abstract ideas they represent more readily to mind than a single, personal deity.¹¹⁴ Given the Smyrna statues' attributes, which invite allegorical reading, Nemesis' duality might reflect the idea of having to pay double when revenge is extracted. A story which has a number of points in common with the case of Smyrna is the Herodotean account of Alyattes (Gyges' grandson) and the temple of Athene at Assesos: in the course of Lydian raids on Milesian territory the temple was accidentally burnt down; on his return to Sardis, Alyattes fell ill, and did not recover until, on the advice of Delphi,

¹⁰⁹ Schweitzer 1931, 203.

¹¹⁰ Laroche 1949, 105; he rejects the idea of an archaic cult as entirely conjectural. A number of late sources give Nemesis the cult title Adrasteia, "the inescapable", usually in connection with an altar or temple supposedly founded by the Argive Adrastos, beside the river Aisepos near Kyzikos, in an area called the "Plain of Adrasteia": Strabo 1.13.1 and Harpokr. s.v. Ἀδράστεια (both citing Antimachos); Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀδράστεια. The etymology is a little contrived, however, and Adrasteia first appears quite independently of Nemesis in the fifth century, her Athenian cult apparently sharing accounts with that of Bendis: Parker 1996, 195, 197. A later syncretism may be suggested by our accounts of Adrastos' foundation, but an independent Adrasteia can still be found in Hellenistic and Roman imperial literature, e.g. Kall. *Hymn to Zeus* 47, Paus. 10.37.8, Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 657e. A communality of function for the two goddesses by the second century AD may be suggested by the odd detail that Lucian's prostitutes all swear by Adrasteia, Alkiphron's by Nemesis: Laroche 1949, 100-02. See Farnell (1896-1909, II 499-500) for references; Karanastassi (1992, 736) comments on Adrasteia's absence from the plastic arts.

¹¹¹ Farnell 1896-1909, II 493-4; Ehrenberg 1921, 35 n.8.

¹¹² Price 1971 catalogues various types of dual and multiple deities; she notes the same phenomenon in modern Greek thought with duplicate St. Theodores (68).

¹¹³ Hes. *Theog.* 223, 197-201. Shapiro 1993, 173-4; Farnell 1896-1909, II 493-4.

¹¹⁴ Farnell (1896-1909, II 497): "the Nemeseis of Smyrna... appear not so much as divinities of real flesh and blood, but as forms of moral allegory, bearing in their hands the staff and bridle, the symbols of order and control".

he concluded peace with Miletos and built not one but two temples for Athene at Assesos.¹¹⁵

That even the people of Smyrna were less than unanimous on the issue in the Roman imperial period may be indicated by dedications which vary in honouring singular and plural Nemeseis. “Hermes (made) this vow to Nemesis”¹¹⁶ but “Meliton dedicated these Nemeseis to Agathe Tyche and divine Dionysos Brêsis”.¹¹⁷ Elsewhere in Asia Minor the same variety can be seen: a statue base from Halikarnassos declares “... Nikanoros set up these Nemeseis”,¹¹⁸ whilst at Mylasa, also in Karia, we hear of a priestess and cult statue of Nemesis singular:

Artemisia daughter of Pamphilos, priestess of Nemesis, with her husband Menippos son of Melas, priest of Peitho, dedicated this plinth and the statue and its accessories to Nemesis and to the people.¹¹⁹

The link with Peitho is interesting, but may be incidental, and we have no other evidence for Nemesis at Mylasa.¹²⁰ Two references to building work at Smyrna mention the decoration of a stoa and some sort of addition to the sanctuary “of the supreme Nemeseis”.¹²¹ The former work is recorded as the gift of one Claudius Bassus, “*agonothetes* of the Nemeseis”, which would suggest that, as at Rhamnous, the Nemeseis of Smyrna were honoured with games.¹²²

¹¹⁵ Hdt 1.22; Alan Griffiths' idea. Cf. also story of the death of the Spartan general Pausanias: having taken refuge in the temple of Athene Chalkioikos, he was besieged and starved to death by the Spartan ephors; this sacrilege brought a curse (unspecified) on the Spartans, until they obeyed Delphi's instructions to “give back two bodies instead of one” to Athene, by dedicating two bronze statues of Pausanias (Thuc. 1.134).

¹¹⁶ Smyrna 131 (= C/G II 3164): Νεμέσει Ἐ[ρ]μᾶς εὐχήν, no date, against the figure of a woman.

¹¹⁷ Smyrna 121 (= C/G II 3161): ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ τὰς Νεμέσεις Μελίτων ἀνέθηκε θεῷ Βρήσει Διονύσῳ, probably imperial.

¹¹⁸ Halikarnassos 77 (= C/G II 2662): Ἰάσων Νικάν[ό]ρος τὰς Νεμέ/σει[ς] ἀνέ[θ]ηκεν (Roman).

¹¹⁹ Inscribed on a fragment of architrave; Mylasa 146 (BCH 5, 1881, 39): Ἀρτεμεισία Παμφίλου, ἱέρηα Νεμέσεως, μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς/ Μενίππου τοῦ Μέλανος, ἱερέως Πειθοῦς, ἀνέθηκεν τό τε βῆμ[α]/ καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα καὶ τὰ σὺν αὐτῷ Νεμέσει καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.

¹²⁰ No indication of date given. A curse in an inscription found near the river Asopos at Phlious in the Argolid specifically describes Nemesis as ἀπειθής: “The avenging justice of inexorable Nemesis hangs over you even though you have fled” (δίκη δὲ ἐπικρέματάι σου/ τιμωρὸς ἀπελθόντι περ/ ἀπειθῆς Νεμέσε[ω]ς, IG IV 444 = S/G³ 1176, no date given).

¹²¹ Smyrna 59.2-5 (= C/G II 3163): Παπίνιος ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐγκατοχήσας τῷ κυρίῳ Σαράπιδι/ παρὰ ταῖς Νεμέσεσιν, εὐξάμενος αὐξῆσαι τὸ Νεμέσειον,/ τὸν παρατεθέντ<α> οἶκον ταῖς Νεμέσεσιν ἀνιέρωσεν, ὥς/ εἶναι ἐν ἱερῷ τῶν κυρίων Νεμέσεων τὸ ὅλον, AD 211/12.

¹²² Smyrna 54.4-6 (= C/G II 3148): Κλ(αύδιος) Βάσσος ἀγωνοθέτης/ Νεμέσεων στρώσειν τὴν βασι-/λικήν· Φοῦσκος ἔργον ποιήσειν, AD 124/138. Cf. Halikarnassos 78 (= C/G II 2663), a dedication recording a gladiator's personal devotion to the two goddesses: Στέφανο<ς> ῥητιάρις/ ν(ικῶν) Ἡ στε(φάνων) Ε πρῶτος/ πάλος εὐχαριστῶν/ κυρίαις Νεμέσε-/σιν εὐχήν

ICONOGRAPHY OF NEMESIS

If we can take the Roman coin representations as more or less faithful reflections of the Smyrna cult statues, Nemesis has undergone a considerable change in iconography since her first appearance at Rhamnous. When and how this occurred is impossible to establish from the artistic record alone: after Agorakritos' statue and the Berlin amphoriskos we have no depictions of Nemesis until the first century AD. An early third century BC date for the Smyrna statues would accord with Pausanias' foundation myth, however, and Nemesis makes a number of appearances in Hellenistic literature.¹²³ It is the Smyrna type, rather than the Rhamnousian Nemesis, which seems to have had most influence on the images, both artistic and literary, which proliferate in the Roman period.¹²⁴ Nemesis appears both singly and as a pair, sometimes with wings, occasionally accompanied by sphinxes or griffons, always carrying at least one of a selection of attributes: bridle, measuring rod, rudder, wheel and scales. The idea of keeping within limits which was implicit as early as the Hesiod *Works and Days* passage is made explicit with the Smyrna Nemeseis' symbolic accoutrements. An anonymous epigram "On a statue of Nemesis" explains the cubit-rule and bridle: we must do nothing beyond measure nor be unbridled in our speech.¹²⁵ The gesture made by the Nemeseis, raising a fold of their cloaks, could be one of modesty, reminiscent of Nemesis' association with Aidôs,¹²⁶ but it is more interestingly explained as apotropaic, spitting into the *kolpos* to avert envy, a gesture apparently still used against the Evil Eye in modern Greece:

What a good goddess is Nemesis, Alexis, because of whom we spit into our cloak, dreading her as she follows behind us. You did not see her pursuing you, but thought you would have your jealous beauty for ever. Now it has perished utterly; the thrice-angry deity has come, and even we your servants now pass you by.¹²⁷

ἔπεν-/δυτοπαλλίων /ζεῦγος καὶ ἐνώι-/δια καὶ χοῖρον ταῖς/ θεαῖς εὐχαριστήριον./ IOHΛΛ δὲ καὶ τῷ ΦΟΙΝΙ/ [.]ωνην καὶ θυσίας.

¹²³ Suggested by Schweitzer 1931, 204. See e.g. Kallimachos' version of the Erysichthon story: *Hymn to Demeter*, 6.56. Kershaw 1986, ch.4, provides a useful survey of literary references.

¹²⁴ Karanastassi, etc., 1992 have 309 catalogue entries for Nemesis, of which all but 4 refer to Roman imperial period representations. See 735-6 on Nemesis' characteristics and attributes.

¹²⁵ AP 16.223: ἡ Νέμεσις προλέγει τῷ πήχει, τῷ τε χαλινῷ,/ μήτ' ἄμετρον τι ποιεῖν, μήτ' ἄχάλινα λέγειν. Cf. 224.

¹²⁶ It is also reminiscent of the *anakalypteria*, unveiling of the bride, which seems to be common to a number of personifications: see below pp.125 on Peitho and Hygieia (p.146).

¹²⁷ AP 12.229, by Strato. Cf. Theokritos 6.39 for the same gesture, again in an erotic context: ὥς μὴ βασκανθῶ δέ, τρὶς εἰς ἐμὸν ἔπτυσσά κόλπον.

Further attributes are all borrowed from other personifications, again emphasising associations which have been present from the start. The rudder and wheel properly belong to Tyche/Fortuna — the wheel of fortune, the rudder for steering us through the stormy seas of life¹²⁸ — while the scales are those of Justice, Dike/Iustitia. On a third century AD votive relief from Thessaloniki Nemesis carries both a wheel and a pair of scales as she tramples a youth, letting us know that a just fate has overcome him by her agency (FIG. 22).¹²⁹ As for her wings, Pausanias has the rather unlikely-sounding explanation that they are borrowed from Erôs: no ancient images of Nemesis have wings, but “later artists, who want the goddess to appear because someone is love, picture Nemesis with wings as they picture Love”.¹³⁰ Nemesis does indeed appear in an erotic context in a few poems of the *Anthology*, but other considerations are probably more likely to have influenced her iconography.¹³¹ The wings may just generally imply that she will catch up with you however fast you run, or they may be borrowed from Nikê, since, as a sixth-century version of the Persian *hybris* epigram points out, one side’s Victory is another’s Nemesis: “I am still a Victory for the children of Erechtheus, a Nemesis for the Assyrians”.¹³² Such an association with Victory might explain the apparent prevalence of cults of Nemesis in connection with amphitheatres, theatres and games in the imperial period, although the

¹²⁸ Is it coincidental that Kallimachos’ Agamemnon dedicated the rudder of his ship to Artemis at Aulis (*Hymn* 3, 228-32, cf. n.22)?

¹²⁹ Marble votive relief, 3rd century AD, Vienna, Kunsth. Mus. I 808 (Depot); with dedication to Zeus Hypsistos (Karanastassi, etc., 1992, no.163*). Schweitzer’s identification of the figures on a third-century AD relief from Brindisi, perpetuated by Loeb, as Nemesis standing victorious on the prostrate Hybris is quite unsupported by epigraphic evidence or convincing iconographic argument: Brindisi, Mus. Prov.; Loeb 1990, no.1*.

¹³⁰ Paus. 1.33.6. Note Pausanias’ concern to point out that no statue “made by the ancients” had wings, i.e. this is a later development.

¹³¹ Nemesis can bring down the arrogance of a stubborn beloved (*AP* 12.33), punish incautious denigration of a boy’s beauty (12.140-1, 229), or even give Erôs himself a dose of his own medicine (16.251).

¹³² Theaitetos Scholastikos, *AP* 16.221.10: εἰμὶ δὲ καὶ νῶν/ Νίκη Ἐρεχθείδαις, Ἀσσυρίοις Νέμεσις. Cf. Mesomedes l.17, below. According to Pausanias’ description, the Rhamnous statue’s *stephanos* was adorned with figures of Nike. A magnificent picture of Nemesis, and an explanation of her attributes, is given by Nonnos in his *Dionysiaka* (48.378-88; fifth cent. AD). Infuriated by Aura’s vaunting of her superior physical charms and chastity, Artemis seeks Nemesis’ help, asking that her rival be turned to stone or driven mad (in the event she is made to succumb to Dionysos’ passion): Nemesis’ wheel signifies that “she rolls all the proud from on high to the ground with the avenging wheel of justice”; she is winged and accompanied by a griffon, which indicates that she “traverses the four quarters of the world”; with her bit she bridles “high-crested men”; the haughty she whips like a top.

“fate” aspect might also be appropriate to such competitions, or the idea that the successful athlete should not get above himself.¹³³

CONCLUSION

The Nemesis of our later artistic representations, hung about with attributes and none-too-subtle symbolism, seems a long way from the stately, restrained figure of Rhamnous, who in turn is not obviously related to the shape-changing bit-part player in the Trojan myth. But it would clearly be less than accurate to see a straightforward linear development from personal to abstract, since some of Nemesis’ earliest appearances invite an allegorical reading, while the myth of her rape is being related long after she has acquired her armoury of attributes. Essentially, all the elements which inform her later iconography — her associations with fate, justice and modesty — are present from her earliest appearances in Hesiod and the *Kypria*. The idea that Nemesis was originally some sort of “nature deity” is quite unsupported by the literary and material record; any such existence would have to pre-date the earliest usage of the abstract noun, which takes us back into the murky realms of pre-Homeric religious thought. As for the relationship between *nemesis* and *hybris*, even if more has been made of a link between the abstract concepts than is warranted by our ancient texts, the personified Nemesis of Rhamnous is certainly characterised as punisher of the Persians’ *hybris*, whether their crime be defined as arrogance or a more specific aggression against Athens’ territory and pride. The Nemeseis of Smyrna and their descendants, with their bridle and measuring rod, seem to be primarily guardians of proper limits and relationships; *hybris* might well come into the category of transgressive behaviour they keep in check.¹³⁴

Rather than a “mythical” Nemesis having become a “logical” one, I would submit that her character has remained remarkably constant, the apparent differences being largely a matter of presentation, according to the fashion of the times. The

¹³³ See Papostopolou 1989, 368 and nn. 47-51 for references; see 371-8, figs. 16-17 on an early second century AD votive relief from Patras, in which Nemesis not only has wings and a wheel, but is most unusually wearing a cuirass. A pair of statues of the Smyrna-type Nemeseis turn even up at Olympia in the second century AD, standing either side of the east end of the covered way into the stadium. Both have a measuring rod in their left hand, and in their right hand a rudder resting on a wheel: Olympia Museum, Gallery 8, no. 85.

¹³⁴ Cf. Fisher (1992, 357-60) on Herodotos’ Kroisos (1.34): ἔλαβε ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις μεγάλη Κροῖσον, ὡς εἰκάσαι, ὅτι ἐνόμισε ἐαυτὸν εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ἀπάντων ὀλβιώτατον.

explicitly allegorical attributes of the Smyrna Nemeseis would have been unthinkable for a fifth-century representation, while no self-respecting personification of the Hellenistic period could do without. Having begun this chapter with one late hymn which emphasises Nemesis' omniscience and justice, I shall conclude with another, written under Hadrian, which goes even further in combining the traditional form with a thoroughly allegorised Nemesis. Mesomedes' *Hymn to Nemesis* manages to include every single one of the goddess' attributes and associations I have touched upon:

Winged Nemesis, balance of life,
 dark-eyed goddess, daughter of Justice,
 you who hold in check the vain neighing
 of mortals with adamantine bit;¹³⁵
 hating the deadly *hybris* of mortals,
 you drive out black envy;
 beneath your wheel, ever-moving, leaving no track,
 turns the grim fortune of mortals;
 stealthily you walk close at hand,
 you make the proud neck to bend;
 ever you measure life under your cubit-rule,
 ever you frown beneath your veil,
 holding fast the scales in your hands;
 be gracious blessed judge,
 winged Nemesis, balance of life.
 We sing of goddess Nemesis the immortal,
 a long-winged mighty Victory,
 and of her coadjutor, infallible Justice;
 indignant at the pride of mortals,
 you bring them down to Tartaros.¹³⁶

¹³⁵ Cf. Fisher (1992, 119-21) on the application of the term *hybris* to horses and other animals.

¹³⁶ Νέμεσι πτερόεσσα, βίου ροπά,/ κυανῶπι θεά, θύγατερ Δίκας,/ ἃ κοῦφα φρυάγματα θνατῶν/ ἐπέχεις ἀδάμαντι χαλινῶ/ ἔχθουσα δ' ὕβριν ὀλοὰν βροτῶν/ μέλανα φθόνον ἔκτος ἐλαύνεις,/ ὑπὸ σὸν τροχὸν ἄστατον ἀστιβῆ/ χαροπὰ μερόπων στρέφεται τύχα,/ λήθουσα δὲ πὰρ πόδα βαίνεις,/ γαυρούμενον αὐχένα κλίνεις,/ ὑπὸ πῆχυν αἰεὶ βίοτον μετρεῖς,/ νεύεις δ' ὑπὸ κόλπον ὄφρυν αἰεὶ,/ ζυγὸν μετὰ χεῖρα κρατοῦσα./ ἴλαθι μάκαιρα δικασπόλε,/ Νέμεσι πτερόεσσα, βίου ροπά,/ Νέμεσιν θεὸν ἄδομεν ἀφθίταν, Νίκην τανυσίπτερον ὀμβρίμαν,/ νημερτέα καὶ πάρεδρον Δίκας,/ ἃ τὰν μεγαλανορίαν βροτῶν/ νεμεσῶσα φέρεις κατὰ ταρτάρου (ed. Heitsch, 1963, l.26).

Chapter 4

PEITHO: SEX AND RHETORIC¹

οὐκ ἔστι Πειθοῦς ἱερὸν ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος

Peitho has no other temple but reason.

Aristophanes *Frogs* 1391²

The cults of Themis and Nemesis, it would seem then, have early histories confined to particular localities, whence they are disseminated quite possibly via the influence of epic. We come now to our first example of a personification who has a consistent association with a particular Olympian deity, allowing us to examine the epithet theory more fully than proved possible in the case of Themis. Peitho, Persuasion, again has some mythological role, though not as dramatic as that of Nemesis nor as well documented as that of Themis. She is assistant to Aphrodite in Hesiod's account of the creation of Pandora (see below), and appears in the same capacity in a number of visual narratives, notably at the birth of Aphrodite and in the seduction of Helen. Unlike Themis and Nemesis, Peitho is rarely found independently in cult, being almost always linked with Aphrodite, and the closeness of this association is demonstrated by a number of occurrences of Peitho as a cult title of Aphrodite. Both Peitho the goddess and *peitho* the concept have, of course, been much studied, but there is more to be said.³ In particular, a fuller discussion is needed of the cult evidence, and not just the Athenian cult, and of the evidence for Peitho's role in marriage. Like Aristophanes' Euripides, modern commentators examining the workings of Peitho often associate both the abstract *peitho* and its personification with *logos*, combining the two to give a definition of *peitho* as the principle of winning over

¹ Versions of this chapter have been delivered as papers at the Classical Association AGM in St. Andrews, April 1995, and the University of Wales Classics Colloquium at Gregynog, December 1995. Thanks are due to both audiences, especially to Sue Blundell and Richard Seaford, for their comments. I present a synopsis of the evidence for Peitho's involvement in the wedding elsewhere, in a discussion of Plutarch and the "tradition of persuasion" (Stafford 1999a).

² Euripides is the speaker; cf. Eur. *Antigone* fr.170 Nauck: οὐκ ἔστι Πειθοῦς ἱερὸν ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος, / καὶ βωμὸς αὐτῆς ἔστ' ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσει.

³ Peitho's iconography is covered most recently in Icard-Gianolio 1994. Richard Buxton's well known study of *peitho* in tragedy (1982) includes a systematic treatment of Peitho in literature, and Shapiro (1993) covers representations of Peitho in vase-painting in some detail. Both discuss her cult, but not at length; see also Simon 1965 and Hamdorf 1964, 63-4. Pirenne-Delforge (1991) gives a fuller treatment of the cults at Athens, Sikyon, Argos and Megara, but focusses almost exclusively on the literary evidence, relegating epigraphic material to a brief appendix.

others to do what you want by means of rational argument.⁴ While Peitho does undeniably have a rhetorical side, however, she is equally active in the erotic sphere, an aspect which is especially apparent in evidence for her cult and in her representations in the visual arts. A closer look at these may balance the emphasis on Peitho's rhetorical aspect almost inevitably given by studies of literary *peitho*.⁵

Peitho's very first appearance in literature establishes her association with Aphrodite, and her special sphere of influence, with its inherent danger.⁶ In Hesiod's *Works and Days* version of the Prometheus story, Zeus instructs Hephaistos to make Pandora as a punishment for man; Athene is to teach her weaving, Hermes to give her "lies and crafty words and a deceitful nature" (77-8), and Aphrodite to endow her with "grace and cruel longing" (65-6). Aphrodite delegates her task to appropriate assistants:

And the divine Graces and lady Persuasion put golden necklaces around her neck, and the rich-haired Seasons garlanded her with spring flowers.⁷

Persuasion's "gift" is not one of eloquence, but of sexual attractiveness, expressed in visual terms. Extravagant adornment is always regarded with suspicion in Greek literature, but golden necklaces may particularly convey the threatening aspect of woman's seductiveness, given the negative connotations attached to such jewellery in stories like the bribing of Eriphyle. The seductive properties of these ὄρμοι χρυσεῖοι are made explicit by the scholiast — "because the adorned woman quickly persuades the man/her husband to intercourse" — who refers to Peitho as one of the Charites, along with Aglaia and Euphrosyne. This identification is also made by the Hellenistic elegiac poet Hermesianax, quoted by Pausanias in the course of a discussion of the Graces prompted by his visit to Orchomenos, their major cult site; the Boiotians themselves, though do not seem to have been concerned to give their three Charites

⁴ See e.g. Worthington ed.1994 for a collection of recent essays on rhetorical persuasion.

⁵ An interesting exception is Gross 1985, a study of the development of rhetorical traditions in amatory literature; see especially 32-68 on "the rhetoric of seduction". Pirenne-Delforge's study of the cult evidence likewise leads her to emphasise Peitho's erotic/political duality and her role in marriage (1991).

⁶ Peitho also appears at *Theog.* 349, but only as a name in a long list of daughters of Okeanos and Tethys.

⁷ Hes. *Op.* 73-5: ἀμφὶ δὲ οἱ Χάριτες τε θεαὶ καὶ πότνια Πειθῶ/ ὄρμους χρυσεῖους ἔθεσαν χροῖ· ἀμφὶ δὲ τήν γε/ ὦραι καλλίκομοι στέφον ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν·

individual names.⁸ The association of Peitho with the Charites and Hermes also appears in evidence for her cult on Paros, Thasos and Lesbos, and Plutarch offers an explanation which I shall consider below, in connection with Peitho's role in marriage.⁹ Peitho's association with Aphrodite, and her rather ambiguous character, will be a recurrent theme throughout this chapter.

CULTS OF PEITHO: ISLANDS AND ASIA MINOR

Rubensohn states that the cult of Peitho on Paros is the oldest for which we have evidence.¹⁰ The only evidence for Peitho's presence here is a Hellenistic inscription associating her with the Charites, but inscriptions from the Parian colony Thasos may indicate a cult there from the late fifth century. Rubensohn's argument is, simply, that the cult must have been exported to Thasos with the Parian settlers, c.710-680 BC, so must already have been established on Paros by the seventh century. The principle that a cult common to mother-city and colony should predate the colonisation seems reasonable, but far from conclusive. Surely contact between the two continues, allowing for cultural as well as economic exchange. In this case, both islands were active traders: Thasos was made rich by its gold mines, developed a flourishing export of wine under Macedonian control, and under the Roman empire enjoyed an international reputation for its marble and oil;¹¹ Paros was famous for its fine marble throughout antiquity, and exported sculptors such as Agorakritos.¹² One would expect religious development to be characteristic of such outward-looking communities, and

⁸ Paus. 9.35.5 (= Hermesianax fr.11 P): Ἑρμῆσιάννακτι δὲ τῷ τὰ ἐλεγεία γράψαντι τοσόνδε οὐ κατὰ τὴν τῶν πρότερον δόξαν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ πεποιημένον, ὥς ἡ Πειθὼ Χαρίτων εἷη καὶ αὐτὴ μία. On the Charites at Orchomenos, see Schachter 1986-94, I.140-44.

⁹ For literary association of Peitho with the Charites, cf. Ibykos fr. 288 Page. Peitho and a singular Charis appear in Pindar's poem in praise of Theoxenos of Tenedos: ἐν δ' ἄρα καὶ Τενέδῳ/ Πειθὼ τ' ἔναιεν καὶ Χάρις/ υἱὸν Ἀγησίλα (fr. 123.13-15 M). Shapiro (1993, 187) takes this as implying "that Peitho and Charis were divinities on the island of Tenedos", but surely this is optimistic. If anything about a real cult can be deduced from the literary compliment, the opposite interpretation would make just as much sense: even in Tenedos (that island bereft of the goddesses of attraction) seductive charm and grace can be found in Theoxenos.

¹⁰ Rubensohn 1949, col.1845-6: "Es ist der älteste nachweisbare Kult der Göttin".

¹¹ Thasian stamped amphoras found e.g. in the Athenian Agora attest the wine trade from the fifth century (Grace 1946). On the evidence for trade provided by amphoras, both local and imported, dating from the fifth to the first centuries BC, from excavations at the port of Thasos, see Grandjean 1992. On pottery production in the late archaic period at the site of Phari on the south-west coast of Thasos, see Blondé et al. 1992.

¹² On Paros' external relations in the sixth century, see Berranger 1992, 283-332, especially 294-306 on the marble, wine and boat-building trades.

special interaction between the colony and its founder would not be surprising.¹³ Both Rubensohn's argument and my own are from probability, admittedly, but against his case for an archaic cult of Peitho is the complete lack of evidence from anywhere else, despite her relative visibility from the fifth century on.

It will perhaps be helpful to look at the two islands separately. For the Parian cult our only information is the first century BC inscription on a white marble table, now in the island's museum: "Thrasyxenos son of Thrason, to Peitho and the Charites".¹⁴ Having once established this association between Peitho and the Charites, Rubensohn treats them as a unit.¹⁵ So for the antiquity of the cult he adduces the Apollodoran *Bibliothēke*'s aetiology for the Parians' style of sacrifice to the Charites:

Minos was sacrificing to the Charites on Paros when he heard the news of his son's death; he ripped the wreath from his head and stopped the music, but none the less completed the sacrifice. Because of this, to this day on Paros they sacrifice to the Charites without pipes and wreaths.¹⁶

Certainly the attribution of the custom's inception to Minos would indicate that the ritual was seen as "ancient", but from the *Bibliothēke*'s perspective this may only mean fifth century. Rubensohn seems untroubled about the absence of any mention of Peitho.¹⁷

¹³ Pouilloux (1954, 336-9) discusses the problem of the relationship between the cults of the two islands. He asks whether it is legitimate to imagine "une telle diversité de dieux" being imported all at once by the first settlers; he does cite the cult of the Charites and Peitho as a possible example of such a primary export, but with caution. Berranger considers the cults of Paros and Thasos in assessing relations between the two islands (1992, 184-203); he concludes that the Charites came with the Parian colonists to Thasos, but "il n'est pas aussi sûr que Peithô soit venue avec elles" (195-8).

¹⁴ *IG* XII suppl. 206: Θρα[σ]ύξενος Θράσωνος/ Πειθοῖ καὶ Χάρισιν. The same Thrasyxenos appears in a list of people who ἐπέδωκαν τῷ δήμῳ εἰς τὴν σιτομετρίαν (*IG* XII 5.135,5), and also made dedications to Aphrodite Timouche (*IG* XII 5.222) and Agathe Tyche (*IG* XII 5.249): Peek 1934, 60.

¹⁵ Rubensohn 1949, 1845-6. Peek likewise fails to note any possible distinction between the two (1934, 60).

¹⁶ *Bibl.* 3.15.7: Μίνως δέ, ἀγγελθέντος αὐτῷ τοῦ θανάτου, θύων ἐν Πάρῳ ταῖς Χάρισιν, τὸν μὲν στέφανον ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔρριψε καὶ τὸν αὐλὸν κατέσχε, τὴν δὲ θυσίαν οὐδὲν ἥττον ἐπετέλεσεν· ὅθεν ἔτι καὶ δεῦρο χωρὶς αὐλῶν καὶ στεφάνων ἐν Πάρῳ θύουσι ταῖς Χάρισιν. Cf. Kallimachos *Aitia* I frs. 3-6 Pf.

¹⁷ The last piece of "evidence" Rubensohn adduces for the Parian Peitho is the inscription Prott-Ziehen II 119, with Furtwängler-Reichhold pl. 78.2 as comparandum. The latter is a squat lekythos in the manner of the Meidias Painter, which depicts Aphrodite and her retinue, with Peitho filling a *kanoun* (below n.147). The former not only has Peitho as an epithet of Aphrodite, rather than as a separate deity, but also comes from Lesbos, not Paros (below p.128). Quite how a late fifth century Athenian vase and a Hellenistic Lesbian law relating to Aphrodite Peitho constitute evidence for "an ancient cult of Peitho" on Paros is not immediately obvious.

For Thasos we have three inscriptions to consider. A relief of c.470 BC, now in the Louvre, depicts Hermes and the Charites, with the inscription: “For the Charites it is not the custom (to sacrifice) either a goat or a pig”.¹⁸ Exactly the same proscription is made for sacrifices to Peitho in a second century BC inscription from the prytaneion.¹⁹ Lastly, a late fifth century marble stele from Thasos bears the inscription “sanctuary of Peitho”.²⁰ The two sacrifice regulations are interesting, since goats and pigs are common sacrificial victims, at the more modest end of the economic scale, so their prohibition would have serious practical consequences.²¹ Pigs are specifically prohibited for Aphrodite in Pausanias’ account of her cult at Sikyon, although any other victims are allowed, and pigs, along with birds, are proscribed as offerings for Aphrodite Peitho and Hermes on Lesbos (below).²² The prohibition of birds is especially puzzling, since Aphrodite’s most commonly attested victims are doves.²³ In the absence of further information, however, the significance of the Thasian regulations remains something of a mystery.²⁴ The repetition between the two inscriptions certainly allows us to argue for strong links between the cults of the Charites and of Peitho at the time of the later inscription, but the assumption of Peitho’s presence before the second century BC is unfounded. If anything, the existence of the later inscription might indicate that Peitho’s cult had only just been assimilated to that of the Charites, the association marked by application of the sacrificial formula established for the older cult to the new arrival.

¹⁸ IG XII 8.358 b (= SEG II 506, Prott-Ziehen II 109; Louvre MA 696.9800617): Χάρισιν αἶγα οὐ θέμις οὐδὲ χοῖρον. The female figure behind Hermes has sometimes been identified as Peitho (e.g. by Hamdorf 1964, no.479), but with little security (Icard-Gianolio 1994, no.55; Shapiro 1993, 187, with nn.419-21).

¹⁹ IG XII suppl. 394: Πειθοῖ αἶγα οὐδὲ χοῖρον οὐ θέμις. Pouilloux (1954, 333) thinks it likely that this civic cult of Peitho is earlier than the second century BC, but his argument is hardly compelling: “qui plus qu’ elle avait qualité pour concilier les divergences?”

²⁰ IG XII 8.360: Πειθὸς ἱερόν. Published Reinach, BCH 6 (1882) 43.

²¹ See Burkert 1985a, 13, 65, and 55, with nn.1-4 for references, on choice of sacrificial victims for particular deities. Pigs are especially associated with Demeter, e.g. having a purifying “scapegoat role” in the Eleusinian Mysteries. Goats are most often mentioned in connection with Artemis and Apollo, e.g. Spartan sacrifice to Artemis Agrotera before battle (*ibid.* 60, n.37), and the famous Horn Altar of Artemis on Delos was made of goat horns, presumably collected from sacrifices (*ibid.* 92).

²² Sikyon: Paus. 2.10.4-6.

²³ See Pirenne-Delforge 1994 on offerings to Aphrodite: in general, 375-80; on animal victims (including goats), 384-8; on the prohibition of pigs, 388-93. She links the Thasian regulations with Aphrodite, seeing Peitho and the Charites as the goddess’ “suivantes habituelles” (392).

²⁴ Cf. Cole 1992 for the formula *ou themis* in sacred laws concerning women.

This leaves us with the succinct Πειθῶς ἱερόν inscription as our only real evidence for a pre-Hellenistic cult on Thasos. Such a stele could plausibly have been a boundary-marker for a “sanctuary of Peitho”, although Themis and Nemesis are the only other personifications who we know to have acquired sufficient stature to warrant an entire sanctuary in the fifth century, and elsewhere, as we shall see, Peitho generally shares a precinct with Aphrodite.²⁵ Our only other attestation of a Πειθοῦς ἱερόν is at Sikyon, and there Pausanias’ description leaves room for doubt as to what exactly is meant (below). Without more information on this inscription’s context, however, little more can be established than that worship of Peitho was not unknown on Thasos in the late fifth century, and by the second century BC her cult was associated with that of the Charites.²⁶ On Paros Peitho’s cult cannot reliably be dated before the first century BC.²⁷

The Lesbos inscription is on a marble stele found at Mytilene, and is one of three attestations we have of Peitho as an epithet of Aphrodite:

The god. Agathe Tyche. Whoever wishes to sacrifice on the altar of Aphrodite
Peitho and of Hermes, let him sacrifice...²⁸

Here again we have the association of Aphrodite/Peitho with Hermes, recalling the Hesiod passage and the Parian and Thasian cults. The inscription is interesting for its explicit instructions, giving a rare insight into the practical details of a particular cult’s practice. The Thasian Peitho was not to receive goats or pigs; Mytilene’s Aphrodite Peitho may be given any animal except pigs and birds. Although Peitho here is an epithet of Aphrodite, she is an independent deity in a fragment of Lesbos’ most famous poet: “Sappho says that Persuasion is daughter of Aphrodite”.²⁹ Aischylos follows this genealogy in the *Suppliants*, where the chorus sing of “Desire and bewitching

²⁵ On boundary-stones, see Ober 1995 and Oliver 1998.

²⁶ If I am right in arguing for an Athenian cult of Peitho being established by the same period (below), this could have been influential. For Athenian presence on Thasos at about the right time we have Thucydides’ account of the relief force he himself led from the island, which arrived too late to break Brasidas’ siege of Amphipolis in 424 BC (Thuc. 4.104-6).

²⁷ Pirenne-Delforge includes the Parian and Thasian inscriptions in her discussion of the association of Aphrodite’s cult with magistrates (1994, 405-6) and with civil harmony in general (446-50). Mention of an Aphrodite Pandemos in a Parian inscription of the third century BC (IG XII 5.221) might again suggest a link with the Athenian cult of Peitho (448 n.253).

²⁸ IG XII 2.73, 1-4: θεός. τύχα ἀγάθα./ ὃ κε θέλη θύην ἐπὶ τῷ βώμῳ/ τᾷς Ἀφροδίτας τᾷς Πείθως καὶ τῷ Ἑρμα, θυέτω...

²⁹ Sappho fr. 200 Campbell (Schol. Hes. Op. 73c): Σαπφὼ δέ φησι τὴν Πειθὴν Ἀφροδίτης θυγατέρα. Cf. fr. 90.1a.

Persuasion, to whom nothing is denied” in their mother’s train, but elsewhere a family relationship is not specified.³⁰ For a straightforward version of the epithet theory to work here, we would expect a sequential development: Persuasion is seen as an aspect of Aphrodite’s influence, so the latter is worshipped as Aphrodite Peitho; the relationship between the goddess and the particular sphere of her influence being invoked receives poetic expression as that between mother and daughter, on the archaic genealogical principle; Persuasion comes to be seen as a separate, anthropomorphic deity in her own right. Unfortunately, we have no evidence for the last step in the sequence on Lesbos, Peitho appearing as a cult epithet of Aphrodite long after Sappho’s “liberation” of her into poetic independence. The linear development model obviously cannot be applied here, the scant evidence pointing rather to a more fluid relationship between goddess and aspect.

We may have an actual representation of Aphrodite Peitho on a fourth or early third century stele from Knidos in Karia, well known for its cult of Aphrodite. The stele, now in a school at Resadiye, has two female figures in high relief, and to the left of the left figure’s head is the dedication: “... to Aphrodite Peitho”; the first line was probably the dedicator’s name.³¹ Unfortunately the figures are damaged, but both are dressed in Ionic chiton, the figure to the left raising her arm, the one to the right drawing her himation over her shoulder. They might be Aphrodite and Peitho, or Aphrodite Peitho and the dedicator, or simply two worshippers; whatever the interpretation, Peitho is here, as at Mytilene, being worshipped as an aspect of the Olympian goddess. Also in Karia we hear of a priest of Peitho at Mylasa, “Menippos son of Melas”, married to a priestess of Nemesis.³²

CULTS OF PEITHO: MAINLAND GREECE

Our only epigraphic evidence for an Aphrodite Peitho on mainland Greece is an inscription from Pharsalos in Thessaly: “a torch for Aphrodite Peitho”.³³ The use of the Homeric δάφον, rather than λαμπάς, for torch could indicate an archaic date, but

³⁰ Aisch. *Suppl.* 1038-40: μετάκοινοι δὲ φίλα ματρὶ πάρεσιν/ Πόθος ἅ τ’ οὐδὲν ἄπαρνον/ τελέθει θέλκτορι Πειθοῖ.

³¹ SEG 12.423: ... /Ἀφροδίται/ Πειθοῖ. See Bean and Cook 1952, esp. 185-201, pl. 40c, for description and photograph.

³² Above p.118. See Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 398-400.

³³ IG IX 2.236: δάφον τὰφ[ρο]δίται τῇ Πειθοῖ.

the editor of *IG IX 2.236* does not commit himself, having been unable to trace the actual inscription; Shapiro refers to this as “fifth century” without comment, as does Icard-Gianolio.³⁴ Reference to a torch might suggest a wedding context, a context in which Peitho seems to have played a role in Classical Athens; we might imagine a private dedication of a torch used in a wedding to Aphrodite Peitho after the ceremony, in the same way as wedding vases were dedicated to Nymphe after the event in Athens.³⁵ Alternatively, the torch may have more local significance as an attribute of Enodia/Hekate, perhaps suggesting that the dedication was made on the occasion of the death of an unmarried girl.³⁶

A votive statue of Peitho is attested for Olynthian territory in Chalkidike by a second or early first century BC inscription on a statue base:

Dionysios son of Kallistratos, Apollodoros son of Apollodoros, Herakleides son of Seranbylios, as *agoranomoi*, to Peitho.³⁷

The letter forms date this to the second or even early first century BC, long after the destruction of Olynthos by Philip in 328 BC, but the area continued to be called Olynthia and several Hellenistic Olynthians are known.³⁸ The inscription is of interest in giving the number of *agoranomoi* as three, compared to Athens’ five (plus five for the Peiraeus).³⁹ The Athenian *agoranomoi* supervised markets and settled disputes, seeing that proper weights and measures were used, and they sometimes fixed the price of grain and bread. To explain why the Olynthian *agoranomoi* should set up a dedication to Peitho, Robinson reasonably suggests that they may also have fixed the salaries of *hetairai*, and this is supported by an entry in the *Suda* which records just such a function for officials of the same name.⁴⁰ Similarly, Aristotle assigns to the *astynomoi* of Athens and the Peiraeus the task of “overseeing the flute-girls and harp-

³⁴ Shapiro 1993, 187; Icard-Gianolio 1994, 243.

³⁵ Oakley and Sinos 1993, 42, 43. See below on Peitho and the wedding, and on Aphrodite and Nymphe.

³⁶ On the iconography of Thessalian Enodia/Hekate, see Chrysostomou 1994; see above p.72. On the torch and conflation of wedding and death imagery, see Jenkins 1983.

³⁷ Robinson 1933 (photo fig. 2): Διονύσιος Κα[λ]λι[στ]ράτου/ Ἀπολλόδορος Ἀπολλοδώρου/ Ἡρακλείδης Σηρανβυλίου/ ἀγορανομήσαντες/ Πειθῇ.

³⁸ See Demosthenes *Phil.* 3.117 on the thoroughness of the destruction.

³⁹ Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 51.1

⁴⁰ *Suda* s.v. Διάγραμμα: τὸ μίσθωμα. διέγραφον γὰρ οἱ ἀγορανόμοι, ὅσον ἔδει λαμβάνειν τὴν ἐταίραν ἐκάστην. Cf. *BCH* 4 (1880) 400 for *agoranomoi* making a dedication to Aphrodite. See Buxton 1982, 32 with nn.9-12.

girls and lyre-girls so that they might not be paid more than two drachmas”.⁴¹ Perhaps the Olynthian *agoranomoi* were in the habit of taking a cut of the prostitutes’ earnings, as an official tax or otherwise, and so felt it appropriate to make a dedication to one of the prostitutes’ patron deities in recognition of their profits; that they should choose Peitho rather than the more obvious Aphrodite might reflect local circumstances of the cult, though we have insufficient information to do more than hazard a guess.⁴²

In the Peloponnese Peitho’s rhetorical side is more apparent than it has been so far, and she seems generally to be associated with Artemis rather than Aphrodite. Pausanias explains the worship of Peitho at Sikyon by a rather obscure story of how Apollo and Artemis were “persuaded” to return to the city:

As you enter the market-place there is a sanctuary of Peitho, which has no statue either. They came to worship Peitho according to the following story. After killing the Python, Apollo and Artemis came to Aigialeia for purification. Terror came upon the people in the place even now called Fear; the deities turned to Karmanor, who was in Crete, but a plague gripped the people in Aigialeia; the seers told them to propitiate Apollo and Artemis. So they sent seven boys and as many girls to the river Sythas as suppliants; they say that the gods were persuaded by these to come into the akropolis of the time, and the place where they first arrived is the sanctuary of Peitho. Something similar is done even to this day: the children go to the Sythas on the feast of Apollo, they say, bring the gods into the sanctuary of Peitho, then bring them back again to the temple of Apollo. The temple is in the modern market-place...⁴³

Here again we apparently have a *ιερόν* of Peitho, and Pausanias does usually use the word to mean “sanctuary”. The “either” refers to the previous stop on Pausanias’ itinerary, a sanctuary of Artemis Limnaia, which also lacked a statue, though his informants did not know “whether it was taken somewhere else or how it came to be destroyed” (2.7.6); for Peitho’s lack of a statue Pausanias does not hazard an explanation. The “modern” market-place is part of the new town built on the ruins of

⁴¹ Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 50.2.

⁴² Cf. Pindar’s association of Peitho with the temple prostitutes of Aphrodite at Corinth, in a fragmentary ode to the Corinthian Xenophon (464 BC): πολύξενοι νεάνιδες, ἀμφίπολοι/ Πειθοῦς ἐν ἀφνειῷ Κορίνθῳ (fr.122 SM, 1-2).

⁴³ Paus. 2.7.7-8: ἐς δὲ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐσελθοῦσι Πειθοῦς ἐστὶν ἱερόν οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἄγαλμα ἔχον. Πειθῶ δὲ ἐπὶ λόγῳ τοιῷδε αὐτοῖς κατέστη σέβεσθαι. Ἀπόλλων καὶ Ἄρτεμις ἀποκτείναντες Πύθωνα παρεγένοντο ἐς τὴν Αἰγιάλειαν καθαρσίαν ἕνεκα. γενομένου δὲ σφισι δείματος, ἔνθα καὶ νῦν Φόβον ὀνομάζουσι τὸ χωρίον, οἱ μὲν ἐς Κρήτην παρὰ Καρμάνορα ἀπετράποντο, τοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἐν τῇ Αἰγιαλείᾳ νόσος ἐπέλαβε· καὶ σφᾶς ἐκέλευον οἱ μάντιες Ἀπόλλωνα ἰλάσασθαι καὶ Ἄρτεμιν. οἱ δὲ παῖδας ἑπτὰ καὶ ἴσας παρθένους ἐπὶ τὸν Σύθαν ποταμὸν ἀποστέλλουσιν ἱκετεύοντας· ὑπὸ τούτων δὲ πεισθέντας τοὺς θεοὺς φασὶν ἐς τὴν τότε ἀκρόπολιν ἔλθειν, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἔνθα πρῶτον ἀφίκοντο Πειθοῦς ἐστὶν ἱερόν. τούτοις δὲ εἰκότα καὶ νῦν ἔτι ποιεῖται· καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸν Σύθαν ἴασιν οἱ παῖδες τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, καὶ ἀγαγόντες δὴ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐς τὸ τῆς Πειθοῦς ἱερόν αὖθις ἀπάγειν ἐς τὸν ναόν φασὶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. ὁ δὲ ναὸς ἐστὶ μὲν ἐν τῇ νῦν ἀγορᾷ...

the old akropolis, which was razed by Demetrios Poliorketes in 303 BC. Pausanias makes indirect reference to the destruction when he comments that the temple of Apollo he saw was not the original, which had been burnt down (2.7.7); although he does not specify, presumably the sanctuary of Peitho he saw was also a post-303 construction.⁴⁴

The story, however, is obviously supposed to explain a ritual more ancient than the building, set in the heroic past when gods still walked the earth and Sikyon was still called Aigialeia.⁴⁵ The main elements of the story are familiar: a journey for purification after a killing; a plague caused by failure to carry out the purification; advice from seers leading to propitiation; the sanctity of the place of first arrival. But many of the details are obscure. Artemis is not usually involved in the slaying of the Python. There is no obvious reason for Sikyon to be chosen as the place of the purification. Although Phobos as a personification appears in archaic literature and art, and there is some evidence of a cult from the mid-fifth century, I know of no analogies for “a place called Fear”.⁴⁶ Karmanor appears again in Pausanias as father of Chrysothemis of Crete, the legendary first winner of a prize for singing at Delphi; he is “said to have purified Apollo”, but no further information is offered (10.7.2). Frazer suggests the Cretan connection can be explained by the fact that Aigialeia is the name of an island midway between Crete and Kythera, as well as the old name for Sikyon; the island Aigialeia could conceivably be a stopping-off point on the way to Crete from the Peloponnese.⁴⁷ The plague is presumably visited upon the people of Aigialeia because they were too afraid to carry out the required purification for Artemis and Apollo; the gods’ return, and fulfilling of the postponed ritual, will cause the plague to be lifted. But by whom? Usually it is Apollo who *inflicts* plagues, in response to some mortal wrongdoing, and who lifts them when propitiated. Nor is it clear why the

⁴⁴ See Pirenne-Delforge (1994, 129-31) on the incoherence of Pausanias’ account of the old and the new Sikyon, and (129-52) on Aphrodite’s cult at Sikyon; she argues for the cult being associated with the marriage of young girls (141-4), the μῆλον held by the cult statue being especially connected to the wedding (411-2).

⁴⁵ The city appears as Σικυών as early as Homer, in the Catalogue of Ships (Il. 2.572).

⁴⁶ Phobos in literature: son of Ares, Il. 13.298-300, yoked to Ares’ chariot with Deimos, Il. 15.119-20. Art: e.g. chest of Kypselos, Paus. 5.19.4-5. Cult: see above p.52 nn.154-5.

⁴⁷ Frazer 1898, *ad loc.* Cf. Chappell 1994 on the Cretans of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.

Sythas is involved: was the river the place for the gods' purification, or was its help sought as a local deity, acting as intercessor with the Olympians?⁴⁸

The ritual itself sounds old, with elements familiar from other cults. The temporary abandonment of a sanctuary by its cult statues suggests a period of purification, as in the annual procession of the Athenian Plynteria, when ephebes carried the Palladion to the sea for purificatory cleansing, or the Argive procession to bathe the image of Athena.⁴⁹ The visit to the river likewise suggests purification, though it is not clear whether the statues are taken on this part of the procession's journey. The carrying of a cult statue to reenact a god's mythical journey is paralleled by the Great Dionysia procession, in which the old wooden image from Dionysos' Athenian temple was taken to a shrine in the Academy, outside the city walls on the road to Eleutherai, and back again, symbolising the cult's initial transfer.⁵⁰ The selection of seven boys and seven girls immediately recalls the legendary Athenian tribute to the Minotaur, and the number recurs in initiatory institutions like the Corinthian practice of sending seven boys and seven girls to live for a year in the sanctuary of Hera Akraia.⁵¹

Although the ritual sounds plausible, however, the link with Peitho is rather tenuous. Etymological rationalisations that stretch the limits of credulity are, of course, a feature of the genre of *aitia*. Are we actually to believe that the Sikyonians worship Persuasion because once upon a time Apollo and Artemis were "persuaded" to come back to the city? It is remarkable that the story does not involve Peitho herself at all, and she is fairly incidental even to the ritual, in which Peitho's sanctuary merely provides a temporary stop for the cult images of other deities, and which is observed in honour of Apollo. Perhaps this explains why there is no cult statue of Peitho in the sanctuary: it is actually a sanctuary of Apollo and Artemis "the Persuaded", rather than of Persuasion herself, and is empty to allow for its annual visit from the statues of the main temple of Apollo. The sanctuary's emptiness would be a

⁴⁸ On the worship of rivers, see Weiss 1984. For an interpretation of the passage in the context of "arrival myths", see Dowden 1992, 97-8.

⁴⁹ Athenian procession: Plut. *Alk.* 34.1, *IG* II² 1011.11. Argive Palladion: Kallim. *Hymn* 5 and schol. Cf. also the Athenian Skira festival for the ritual abandonment of the sanctuary, Burkert 1985a, 230. See Romano 1988, 128 on the carrying of cult statues in procession.

⁵⁰ Paus. 1.29.2; on Athens' relationship with Eleutherai, see Parker 1996, 93-5.

⁵¹ Eur. *Medea* 1378-82 with schol.; Zenobios 2.30.

reminder of the possibility of being abandoned by Apollo and Artemis, and the festival visit a celebration of the aversion of the threat. If Pausanias' sanctuary really was dedicated to Peitho, though, the unusual lack of any connection with Aphrodite might suggest that her cult was an innovation which arrived with Demetrios Poliorketes' new city, influenced by the rhetorical Peitho of fourth century Athens.⁵²

Whatever the explanation of Sikyon's cult, Pausanias knows of Peitho as an epithet of Artemis at Argos:

The sanctuary of Artemis surnamed Peitho: Hypermestra dedicated this too on defeating her father in the case in which she was put on trial because of Lynkeus.⁵³

This is our only known instance of an Artemis Peitho, though Artemis and Peitho are associated by Plutarch in a wedding context (see below) as well as at Sikyon. Although the *aition* is explicitly rhetorical, an erotic element is not far to seek, as Hypermestra is defending herself against Danaos for *not* having murdered her husband on their wedding night. Although spatial proximity may be coincidental, we might also note that Pausanias has just left the city's archaic sanctuary of Aphrodite.⁵⁴ Two *scholia* on Euripides support the idea that the Argive Peitho is associated with social order, appropriate enough if Artemis Peitho here is a marriage deity: according to one, Argos himself married Peitho, according to the other, she married the Argive culture-hero Phoroneus.⁵⁵ As at Sikyon we cannot establish a date with any certainty: the story is again set in the heroic age, but the idea of Danaos having recourse to the law-courts sounds like a sophistic innovation,⁵⁶ also against an early date is the fact that, apart from the Aphrodite sanctuary, most archaeological remains in the area which Pausanias is discussing, the theatre side of the market-place, are Hellenistic or Roman period.

⁵² Pirenne-Delforge (1991, 408-10) notes that the Sythas is c.15 km from Sikyon, while Peitho's temple is in the city itself. She suggests that Peitho represents "les valeurs typiques de la cité", to which the boys and girls return after some sort of initiation ritual in the "place called Fear" at the margins of the city's territory.

⁵³ Paus. 2.21.1: τὸ δὲ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἐπὶ κλησὶν Πειθοῦς, Ὑπερμήστρα καὶ τοῦτο ἀνέθηκε νικήσασα τῇ δίκῃ τὸν πατέρα ἦν τοῦ Λυγκέως ἔνεκα ἔφυγε.

⁵⁴ On which see Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 153-70, and fig. 9 for its location.

⁵⁵ Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 1116 (quoting Pherekydes); schol. Eur. *Or.* 1246. See Buxton 1982, 35-6, and 67-90 on Aischylos' *Suppliants*. Pirenne-Delforge (1994, 424-6) discusses the Danaid myth in relation to Argive cults associated with marriage and civil harmony; cf. *eadem* 1991, 406-7 on Peitho and Phoroneus.

⁵⁶ Shapiro 1993, 187-8.

Moving towards Athens, we return to a Peitho firmly associated with Aphrodite and the erotic sphere, although not necessarily in receipt of a cult. Pausanias records a statue of Peitho among other personifications in a temple of Aphrodite in the agora at Megara, where Aphrodite has an unusual epithet:

After the sanctuary of Dionysos there is a temple of Aphrodite, and a statue made of ivory of Aphrodite surnamed “Action”. This is the oldest in the temple; Persuasion and another god called Coaxing are the work of Praxiteles; by Skopas are Sex and Desire and Yearning, if the names differ in the same way as their functions.⁵⁷

Aphrodite Praxis does not appear elsewhere, although *πρᾶξις* seems to be a euphemism for sexual intercourse in a number of literary passages; this is also our only attestation of Paregoros.⁵⁸ The fourth-century Megarians evidently spared no expense in their choice of sculptors, and the impression of extravagance is furthered by the multiplicity of statues of such unambiguously erotic personifications.⁵⁹ Pausanias’ comment about the attribution of names to Skopas’ statues is slightly obscure, but could be indicative of the usual problem of identifying unlabelled statues, as he was presumably faced with three statues of winged youths, which could all have been Erotes.

Even closer to Athens, at Daphne a possible mid-fourth-century statue of Peitho appears among a number of dedications from a sanctuary of Aphrodite mentioned by Pausanias (1.37.7). A blue marble statue base of the mid-fourth century bears the inscription: “Kallimachos of Soloi dedicated this to Peitho”. The *τήνδε* must refer to the statue of a female figure, but as the inscription is in verse it is quite possible

⁵⁷ Paus. 1.43.6: μετὰ δὲ τοῦ Διονύσου τὸ ἱερόν ἐστιν Ἀφροδίτης ναός, ἄγαλμα δὲ ἐλέφαντος Ἀφροδίτης πεποιημένον Πρᾶξις ἐπὶ κλησιν. τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀρχαιότατον ἐν τῷ ναῷ· Πειθὼ δὲ καὶ ἑτέρα θεός, ἣν Παρήγορον ὀνομάζουσιν, ἔργα Πραξιτέλους· Σκόπα δὲ Ἔρως καὶ Ἴμερος καὶ Πόθος, εἰ δὴ διάφορά ἐστι κατὰ ταῦτό τοις ὀνόμασι καὶ τὰ ἔργα σφίσι. Pirenne-Delforge (1994, 89) translates the last phrase: “si toutefois leurs champs d’action sont différents comme sont leurs noms”.

⁵⁸ Praxis: e.g. Theok. 2.143, Achilles Tatius, *LC* 1.10.6; Buxton 1982, 32 and n.7. Pirenne-Delforge (1994, 90) takes the epithet more neutrally — “la domaine d’intervention de la déesse est laissé dans le flou par une telle épiclese” — not wishing to limit Aphrodite here to “choses de l’amour”. Paregoros: cf. *P.V.* 645-7, where Io describes the dreams which παρηγόρουν her with smooth words, offering her the delights of *himeros* and *Kypris* (649-50).

⁵⁹ In nearby shrines Pausanias records a Tyche by Praxiteles and a Zeus and Muses by Lysippos (1.43.6). Pirenne-Delforge (1994, 89 and n.40) attributes the Megarians’ ability to commission such famous sculptors to the neutrality they maintained in the conflicts of the first half of the fourth century. She cites Xenophon’s account (*Hell.* 5.4.48) of Agesilaos’ visit to the Megarian sanctuary of Aphrodite in 378/7 as evidence for the goddess’ political significance (1991, 404).

that Peitho is standing in for Aphrodite, *metri gratia*, especially since all the other (prose) dedications from the shrine name Aphrodite herself.⁶⁰

PEITHO AND APHRODITE PANDEMOS AT ATHENS

The evidence we have considered so far is too scattered, both geographically and chronologically, to give more than a general view of Peitho's cult. Turning to Athens, the situation improves dramatically, with information about the goddess Peitho from literature and the visual arts to fill out the framework established by more direct evidence for her cult.

As already mentioned, Pausanias locates a temple to Aphrodite Pandemos and Peitho on the S.W. slope of the Akropolis, between the Asklepieion and the Beulé Gate (FIG. 10):

When Theseus had united the Athenians into one city-state from the demes, he established the worship of Aphrodite Pandemos herself and of Peitho. The ancient statues no longer existed in my time, but those which did were not by the most obscure artists.⁶¹

The attribution of a cult's founding to a hero such as Theseus or Herakles is of course a standard means of establishing the cult's validity. Theseus' exploits provided *aitia* for the introduction of many cults, such as that of Aphrodite Epitragia, and festivals, including the Panathenaia and Synoikia, and his status as Athenian hero *par excellence* was affirmed, after his appearance on the field at Marathon, by Kimon's retrieval of "Theseus' bones" from Skyros, c.477 BC.⁶² Garland connects the hero's supposed responsibility for the synoecism and the founding of the cult of Aphrodite Pandemos and Peitho by understanding the goddesses as "aspects of the co-operative and democratic ethic upon which the polis was founded".⁶³ These aspects are indeed apparent in the *aitia* for Aphrodite's epithet, although they are not the whole story, as

⁶⁰ IG II² 4583: Πειθοῖ Καλλίμα[χος] τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε Σολεύς. Pirenne-Delforge takes the dedicator's home town to be the Soloi in north-west Cyprus, and imagines the Cypriot honouring the patron goddess of his island on his way to be initiated at Eleusis (1994, 73-4); there is, however, another candidate for this Soloi in Kilikia.

⁶¹ Paus. 1.22.3: Ἀφροδίτην δὲ τὴν Πάνδημον, ἐπεὶ τε Ἀθηναίους Θησεύς ἐς μίαν ἤγαγεν ἀπὸ τῶν δήμων πόλιν, αὐτὴν τε σέβεσθαι καὶ Πειθὼ κατέστησε· τὰ μὲν δὴ παλαιὰ ἀγάλματα οὐκ ἦν ἐπ' ἐμοῦ, τὰ δὲ ἐπ' ἐμοῦ τεχνιτῶν ἦν οὐ τῶν ἀφανεστάτων. Cf. above pp.85-6.

⁶² Epitragia: Plut. *Thes.* 18.2. Festivals: Plut. *Thes.* 24.3-4, Paus. 8.2.1, Thuc. 2.15.2. See Garland (1992) for a discussion of the political aspects of introducing new cults in fifth century Athens, and especially 82-98 on Theseus, and 152-70 on the Athenian *aition*.

⁶³ Garland 1992, 91.

we shall see. The link with Theseus' synoecism may suggest a connection with Kleisthenes' reorganisation, which would give us a late sixth century date for the cult's inception or rise to prominence.⁶⁴ A late archaic date can be reasonably established for Aphrodite Pandemos' cult from sources other than Pausanias, but unfortunately none of these mentions Peitho. Representations of Peitho appear in Athenian vase-painting from the beginning of the fifth century, however, and she is mentioned in tragedy as early as Aischylos' *Suppliants* (467-56 BC), which would lend credibility to such a dating, which is also consonant with Pausanias' assumption of the cult's antiquity.⁶⁵

Let us first consider the sources for the cult of Aphrodite Pandemos.⁶⁶ For some sort of shrine to Aphrodite in the area Pausanias describes, though not always bearing the epithet Pandemos, we have plenty of other evidence.⁶⁷ Beschi's more specific location of the sanctuary on the terrace immediately below the Athena Nike bastion is based on epigraphic and architectural finds made when a late wall connecting the bastion with the south tower of the Beulé Gate was demolished in the 1890s, and ceramic finds from excavations of 1960 at the east end of the terrace, including red-figure loutrophoroi and terracotta female figures.⁶⁸ Cuttings in the rock surface of the terrace suggest the position of a small rectangular building, oriented north-south (FIG. 10), to which Beschi assigns three fragments of architrave from the late antique wall, which are decorated with a dove and garland relief (FIGS. 23-4).⁶⁹ These also bear a metrical inscription dating from c.350-20 BC: "We adorn this (temple) for you, o great

⁶⁴ Erika Simon argues that the cult already existed, on the basis of Athenian coins with two janus-headed goddesses, but was of special prominence in Kleisthenes' time (1970, 12-13 and pl.2,4; 1983, 48-51). She adduces Aischylos as witness to Aphrodite and Peitho being "mighty goddesses" in the first half of the fifth century, "where their might is a matter more of political than erotic power" (1983, 50).

⁶⁵ On the *Suppliants*, see Buxton 1982, 67-90.

⁶⁶ For a recent study of Aphrodite Pandemos at Athens, see Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 26-40.

⁶⁷ Shapiro's claim that "its location has not been found" (1993, 186) is somewhat misleading, and odd given that in the same paragraph (187 n.417) he cites Simon 1983 (48-51, pl.15.1) whose brief discussion of Aphrodite Pandemos includes a photograph of the dove-decorated architrave and Beschi's reconstruction of the naiskos (*infra* FIGS. 23-4). He is presumably influenced by the scepticism of Judeich (1931, 285 n.1), whom he cites. Commenting on Pausanias 1.22.3, Wycherley (1978, 131) asserts unequivocally: "We do not know what happened to the shrines of Aphrodite Pandemos, and of Ge Kourotrophos and Demeter Chloe...", although he later (179) notes that "inscriptions relating to these cults have been found in the region...". Pirenne Delforge (1994, 26-8) takes the archaeological evidence to confirm Pausanias, indicating at least a *naiskos*.

⁶⁸ Beschi 1967-8, 517-26, fig. 1. On the inscriptions, see Foucart 1889, 156-166.

⁶⁹ Beschi 1967-8, figs.3-10.

and holy Aphrodite Pandemos, with the gifts of our own images”, the “we” being named as Archinos of the Skambonidai, his maternal aunt Menekrateia, priestess of Aphrodite, and his mother.⁷⁰

A slightly later inscription from the site (287/6 BC) may suggest that the cult was in need of reviving by the early third century. This records a decree concerning the annual ritual “spring cleaning” of the sanctuary, and although Peitho is not mentioned explicitly her presence can perhaps be inferred from the plurality of the statues and altars in question:

May the magistrates successively in office, at the time of the procession in honour of Aphrodite Pandemos, supply a dove for the purification of the temple, have the altars smeared with oil, the (roof timbers) coated with pitch, and the statues washed, and may they also supply a weight of purple...⁷¹

Foucart points out that this is a decree revitalising an old practice rather than introducing a new one, since the ritual is to be performed κατὰ τὰ πάτρια (l.12), in much the same spirit as the religious reforms of Lykourgos a generation or so earlier.⁷² The stipulation of a dove for the purification of the temple is appropriate for Aphrodite, as well as recalling the sacrificial regulations of Thasos and Lesbos, since a pig was the usual victim for such a ceremony.⁷³ Romano assumes that τὰ ἔδη refers to statues of Athena Pandemos and Peitho, carried in procession to a bathing place, and, since such bathing is particularly associated with ancient wooden images, she suggests that perhaps the παλαιὰ ἀγάλματα mentioned by Pausanias were still in existence.⁷⁴ The context here, however, seems to suggest that a practical washing rather than ritual cleansing is meant, although the two need not be mutually exclusive.⁷⁵ The inscription

⁷⁰ IG II² 4596 = CEG II, no.775: τόνδε σοι, ᾧ μεγάλη σεμνή Πάνδημε Ἀφροδίτη, κοσμοῦμεν δώροις εἰκόσιν ἡμετέραις./ Ἀρχῖνος Ἀλυπήτοιο Σκαμβωνίδης, Μενεκράτεια Δεξικράτους Ἰκαριέως θυγάτηρ ἱέρεια τῆς [Ἀφροδίτης, Δ]εξικράτους θυγάτηρ Ἀρχίνου δὲ μήτηρ.

⁷¹ IG II² 659.20-7 (= Sokolowski 1969 no.39): ... τοὺς ἀστυνό-/μους τοὺς αἰὲ λαχόντας, ὅταν ᾗ/ ἡ πομπὴ τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ τεῖ Πανδῇ-/μῳ, παρασκευάζειν εἰς κάθαρσιν/ τοῦ ἱεροῦ περιστεράν, καὶ περιελθεῖ-/ψα]ι τοὺς βωμοὺς καὶ πιττῶσαι τὰς/ ὀροφὰς] καὶ λοῦσαι τὰ ἔδη, παρασκευ-/λάσαι δὲ καὶ πορφύραν ὀλκὴν... Pirenne-Delforge (1994, 29-30) reads θύρας rather than ὀροφὰς in l.26.

⁷² Foucart 1889, 164; on Lykourgos, see above pp.83-4 n.89.

⁷³ On Aphrodite and doves, see Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 31 with nn.80-4, and 415-7; she suggests that the stipulation of a dove for purification here again implies the interdiction of pigs (391-2).

⁷⁴ Romano 1988, 128-9; she adduces as a parallel the festival for Aphrodite at Paphos on Cyprus, where the cult image is carried to the sea, bathed and decked with flowers.

⁷⁵ Beschi (1967-8, 525-6) suggests that the entire structure above the architrave may have been of wood, hence the need for pitch.

also mentions a priestess called Hegesipyle (l.1), who must be represented by a parent (l.17).

For the sanctuary's early fifth-century history, we have another metrical dedication from the area, dating from c.480-70 BC, inscribed on a fragment of column which would probably have supported a votive relief:

(...)odoros dedicated me to Aphrodite as a first-fruit gift.
Lady grant him abundance of all good thing,
and those who say unjust and lying words against him,
on them...⁷⁶

The last clause presumably outlined the redress being sought against the dedicator's opponents with their false accusations. Pirenne-Delforge suggests that the reference to "unjust and lying words" calls to mind a rhetorical Peitho, who might be expected to concern herself with such matters, but there is little basis for the supposition.⁷⁷ A temple to Aphrodite on the south slope of the Akropolis is also attested by several literary sources which mention Phaidra as its founder, for love of Hippolytos. In the *Hippolytos*, Euripides' Aphrodite relates:

Before she (Phaidra) came to this land of Troizen,
beside the rock of Pallas, in sight of this land,
she founded a temple of Aphrodite,
out of love for her absent love; from that time on
the goddess' temple was named after Hippolytos.⁷⁸

Diodoros mentions the story, adding the detail that the temple is sited on a spot "from where one can look across at Troizen".⁷⁹ This is almost certainly poetic licence, as Troizen is in the Argolid on the far side of the Saronic Gulf, but the town is indeed south-west of Athens, so the story accords with the location of our temple of Aphrodite Pandemos. That Phaidra was hoping for assistance from Aphrodite in her "persuasive" aspect is suggested by a scholiast's version of how the story continues:

⁷⁶ IG I³ 832 (DAA no.296, CEG I, no.268): [...]όδορός μ' / ανέθεκ' Ἀφροδίτῃ δῶρον ἀπαρχέν | πότνια τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶι σὺ δὸς ἀφθονίαν | οἳ τε λέγ/οσι λόγος ἀδίκ/[ο]ς ψευδᾶς κα/[τ] ἐκένο]] τοῦ[το/ις....].

⁷⁷ Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 29 and n.71.

⁷⁸ Eur. *Hipp.* 29-33: καὶ πρὶν μὲν ἐλθεῖν τήνδε γῆν Τροιζηνίαν, / πέτραν παρ' αὐτὴν Παλλάδος κατόψιον / γῆς τῆσδε ναὸν Κύπριδος ἐγκαθείσατο, / ἐρῶς ἔρωτ' ἔκδημον Ἴππολύτῳ δ' ἐπὶ / τὸ λοιπὸν ὠνόμαζεν ἰδρῦσθαι θεάν.

⁷⁹ Diod. 4.62.2: ... Φαίδρα διὰ τὸ κάλλος ἐρασθεῖσα αὐτοῦ τότε μὲν ἀπελθόντος εἰς Τροιζῆνα ἰδρύσατο ἱερὸν Ἀφροδίτης παρὰ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, ὅθεν ἦν καθορᾶν τὴν Τροιζῆνα.

“then she went on to Troizen, where she tried to *peithein* the young man to sleep with her.”⁸⁰ A link with Hippolytos is also apparent in Pausanias’ description of the southwest slope of the Akropolis, as his account of Theseus’ establishment of the cult of Aphrodite Pandemos and Peitho follows on from a brief version of the story of Hippolytos, prompted by description of the hero’s memorial, just after the Asklepieion. If Pausanias is to be believed here, the proximity of the temple to the memorial might account for its association with Phaidra.⁸¹

For the epithet Pandemos we have two *aitia*, recorded by Athenaios and Harpokration. Both attribute the founding of the cult to Solon and cite the Hellenistic versifier Nikander of Kolophon for the more colourful explanation. Athenaios also cites the New Comedy poet Philemon (fourth/early third century BC), but only mentions the one story, since it is relevant to his diners’ discussion of prostitution:

Philemon, too, in the *Brothers* records incidentally that Solon, because of young men’s ‘prime’, purchased girls and set them up in brothels. Likewise Nikander of Kolophon also records this in the third book of his *History of Kolophon*, saying that Solon was the first to found a temple of Aphrodite Pandemos from the money made by the women in charge of the brothels.⁸²

Harpokration gives both *aitia* for the epithet, citing Apollodoros of Athens (second century BC) for the alternative. It is not clear which version he found in the fourth century orator Hypereides:

Hypereides, in the *Against Patrokles*, if it is genuine. Apollodoros in his *On the Gods* says that she was so called at Athens after being moved near the old agora, because of the fact that in ancient times *all the people* would gather here in assemblies, which they called agoras. In book six of his *History of Kolophon* Nikander says that Solon bought good-looking women and set them up in a house, for the sake of young men, and out of the revenue founded a temple of Aphrodite Pandemos. It is the common property of *all the demos*.⁸³

⁸⁰ Schol. Od. 11.321: Φαίδρα δὲ ἐρωτικῶς διατεθεῖσα τοῦ Ἰππολύτου, σφοδρῶς ἐπ’ αὐτῷ τηκομένη τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἱερὸν Ἀφροδίτης ἐν Ἀθήναις ἰδρύσατο τὸ νῦν Ἰππολύτειον καλούμενον, εἰς Τροιζῆνα δὲ ὕστερον παραγενομένη διενόεῖτο πείθειν τὸν νεανίσκον ὅπως αὐτῇ μιγείη.

⁸¹ See below n.104 for a possible Nymphe-Troizen link. Pirenne-Delforge (1994, 40-6) cites two inscriptions of the 430s BC which further the possible link between Aphrodite and Hippolytos on the south slope of the Akropolis (IG I³ 383.234-5 and SEG X 227), and examines the case for the memorial of Hippolytos and the sanctuary of Aphrodite being one and the same sanctuary.

⁸² Athen. 13.569d: καὶ Φιλήμων δὲ ἐν Ἀδελφοῖς προσιστορῶν ὅτι πρῶτος Σόλων διὰ τὴν τῶν νέων ἀκμὴν ἔστησεν ἐπὶ οἰκημάτων γυναῖα πριάμενος, καθὰ καὶ Νικάνδρος ὁ Κολοφώνιος ἱστορεῖ ἐν τρίτῳ Κολοφωνιακῶν φάσκων αὐτὸν καὶ πανδήμου Ἀφροδίτης ἱερὸν πρῶτον ἰδρύσασθαι ἀφ’ ὧν ἡργυρίσαντο αἱ προστάσαι τῶν οἰκημάτων. See Halperin (1990, 100-101) on the Philemon passage.

⁸³ Harp. s.v. Πάνδημος Ἀφροδίτη: Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Πατροκλέου, εἰ γνήσιος. Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν τῷ περὶ θεῶν φησιν Ἀθήνησι κληθῆναι τὴν ἀφιδρυθεῖσαν περὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν

The topographical reference to the “old agora” would accord with Pausanias’ location of the temple if, as has often been held, early archaic Athens had its meeting place in the area immediately to the south-west of the Akropolis;⁸⁴ the fragment of Apollodoros is the only text to mention this ancient agora, however, and more recent archaeological finds tend to support a location for archaic Athens’ most important public buildings in the area north-east of the Akropolis.⁸⁵ Whether or not Apollodoros’ explanation of the epithet is to be trusted, it is not incompatible with the more sensational version: Aphrodite may be *Pandemos* because of her temple’s proximity to gatherings of “all the people”, but democratic associations are also to be seen in the story that it was built with the proceeds of the state prostitution which Solon had established, providing good clean sex for all. Indeed, Athenaios goes on to quote Philemon at length, who explicitly calls Solon’s deed a “a democratic act of deliverance”.⁸⁶

The linking of Aphrodite’s epithet *Pandemos* with prostitution is paralleled by Plato’s explanation of the title. In the *Symposium*, Pausanias differentiates Aphrodite *Pandemos* from Aphrodite *Ourania*, the two representing two different sorts of love:

Are there not two goddesses? One is the elder and motherless daughter of Heaven, whom we call by the title “Heavenly”. The other is younger, daughter of Zeus and Dione, whom we call “Common”.⁸⁷

The speech goes on to expand on the opposition between the physical, *pandemos* sort of love, felt indiscriminately and fleetingly by baser men for unintelligent women or boys, and the more spiritual, *ourania* variety, aimed at a lasting, intellectual partnership

ἀγορὰν διὰ τὸ ἐνταῦθα πάντα τὸν δῆμον συνάγεσθαι τὸ παλαιὸν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, ὅς ἐκάλουν ἀγοράς. Νίκανδρος ἐν ζ΄ Κολοφωνιακῶν Σόλωνά φησι σώματα ἀγοράσαντα εὐπρεπῇ ἐπὶ στέγης στήσαι διὰ τοὺς νέους, καὶ ἐκ τῶν περιγενομένων χρημάτων ιδρύσασθαι Ἀφροδίτης πανδήμου ἱερόν. ἔστι δὲ τὸ πάνδημον πάγκοινον.

⁸⁴ Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 1 and n.1. Thucydides (2.15.3) describes Athens before Theseus’ synoecism: “what is now the Akropolis was the city, together with the region at the foot of the Akropolis toward the south”. Wycherley (1978, 178): the shrines of Aphrodite *Pandemos* and *Peitho*, and *Ge* and *Demeter* “may well be associated with the hypothetical primitive agora west of the Acropolis”. From archaeological evidence it seems that before c.700 BC the agora with which we are familiar to the north west of the Akropolis was used for burial, and habitation was largely confined to the Akropolis and immediately surrounding area (Camp 1993, 25-6). The question is discussed at most length, if datedly, by Oikonomides 1964. More recently, Shear (1994, 225-8) puts the case for the ancient agora being in the Plaka area, north-east of the Akropolis, in connection with the sanctuary of *Aglauros*.

⁸⁵ Shear 1994, 225-8 and fig. 1.

⁸⁶ Athen. 13.569e: δημοτικόν... πρᾶγμα καὶ σωτήριον. Halperin (1990, 105) comes to this conclusion in a discussion on the relationship between prostitution and citizenship.

⁸⁷ Plato *Symp.* 180d: πῶς δ’ οὐ δύο τῷ θεῷ; ἡ μὲν γέ που πρεσβυτέρα καὶ ἀμήτωρ Οὐρανοῦ θυγάτηρ, ἣν δὲ καὶ Οὐρανίαν ἐπονομάζομεν· ἡ δὲ νεωτέρα Διὸς καὶ Διώνης, ἣν δὲ Πάνδημον καλοῦμεν. Cf. Xen. *Symp.* 8.9.

with a young man.⁸⁸ In modern terms we might call this the distinction between lust and romantic love, the former very much what Solon's brothels are supposed to have catered for.⁸⁹ The application of such a distinction to two ancient cult titles of Aphrodite is clearly a philosophical conceit, and the use of πάνδημος to mean "common" in a pejorative sense, rather than the more literal "belonging to all the people", is also an innovation.⁹⁰ That Plato's connection of the epithets with physical and spiritual love respectively did not go unnoticed, however, is attested by Pausanias' (the traveller's) account of Aphrodite's cult at Thebes. Three ancient wooden statues of Aphrodite are supposed to have been dedicated there by Harmonia:

They call one of these "Heavenly", another "Common" and the third "Turner Away". Harmonia gave Aphrodite her titles: "Heavenly" for pure love released from bodily desire; "Common" for copulation; thirdly "Turner Away", so that the human race might turn away from lawless passion and unholy deeds.⁹¹

None of these explanations can be taken literally as accounting for the origins of the title Pandemos. The idea of state-sponsored prostitution sounds like wishful thinking, and the attribution of the cult's founding to Solon is much the same as its attribution to Theseus: such a good idea could only have been thought of by Solon the wise. However they do indicate that Aphrodite Pandemos was associated in some way

⁸⁸ Pausanias' ideal of the sustained homosexual relationship is presumably supposed to reflect his own relationship with Agathon (*Symp.* 193b-c). Later in the speech there is a reference to "attempting in speeches to persuade young men" (λόγῳ πειρώμενοι πείθειν τοὺς νέους, 182b), a skill lacked by men in Elis, Boiotia, Sparta and "wherever they are not skilled in speaking". Clearly the "better", Athenian, sort of lover gets his way by means of rhetorical *peitho*.

⁸⁹ Solon set up his brothels "seeing the city full of young men, and that they were in the grip of nature's compulsion and erring towards what they should not" (μεστὴν ὀρώντα τὴν πόλιν νεωτέρων/ τούτους τ' ἔχοντας τὴν ἀναγκαίαν φύσιν/ ἀμαρτάνοντάς τ' εἰς ὃ μὴ προσῆκον, Philemon ap. Athen. 13.569e). On the advantages of brothels over the pursuit of respectable citizen women, cf. Xenarchos, *Pentathlos* fr. 1, and Horace, *Sat.* 1.2.31-4.

⁹⁰ See Burkert (1985, 155) for Aphrodite Ourania as linked with the Phoenician Queen of Heaven; also Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 217-26.

⁹¹ Paus. 9.16.3: καλοῦσι δὲ Οὐρανίαν, τὴν δὲ αὐτῶν Πάνδημον καὶ Ἀποστροφίαν τὴν τρίτην· ἔθετο δὲ τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ τὰς ἐπωνυμίας ἢ Ἀρμονία, τὴν μὲν Οὐρανίαν ἐπὶ ἔρωτι καθαρῷ καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένῳ πόθου σωμάτων, Πάνδημον δὲ ἐπὶ ταῖς μίξεσι, τρίτα δὲ Ἀποστροφίαν, ἵνα ἐπιθυμίας τε ἀνόμου καὶ ἔργων ἀνοσίων ἀποστρέφῃ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Pausanias also mentions a shrine of Aphrodite Ourania at Argos, but without comment (2.23.8); he is more forthcoming about the sanctuary in the Athenian Agora, which he equips with a statue by Pheidias (1.14.7). On the Argive cult see Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 165-7. On the Athenian cult see Wycherley 1978, 73, Thompson and Wycherley 1957, 49-50, and Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 15-25, 34-5 and 66.

with democracy from the fourth century on, which may fit with a picture of Peitho taking on a more rhetorical aspect at the same period.⁹²

For Peitho herself as a real goddess of cult, Aristophanes may be our earliest witness, his *Lysistrata* pouring a libation to Peitho (412/11 BC):

O mistress Peitho and Loving-Cup,
accept our blood-sacrifices and be gracious to us women.⁹³

It is difficult to know whether this can be taken as evidence for an actual cult, as plenty of “joke” deities are invoked in Aristophanes, but we might note that the play is set at the entrance to the Akropolis, just around the corner from the temple of Aphrodite Pandemos; elsewhere in the play Victory is called upon, perhaps an allusion to the temple of Athena Nike above.⁹⁴ The *Frogs* quote with which I began this chapter (405 BC) could be taken at face value as suggesting that the idea of Peitho having a literal temple is ridiculous, but could equally well be basing its humour on the audience’s knowledge of a real temple of Peitho and Aphrodite Pandemos not far from the theatre. While the *Lysistrata* reference seems to be invoking Peitho in her erotic aspect, the *Frogs* line can perhaps be taken as demonstrating her transition from the erotic to the rhetorical. The context is the “weighing of the lines” scene, and Euripides’ line “Peitho has no other temple but reason” is set against Aischylos’ “For alone of gods Thanatos does not love gifts”.⁹⁵ Peitho’s connection with sex and marriage (see below), which ensure the continuation of life, puts her in opposition to Thanatos. The sophistic Euripides naturally lauds Peitho in her rhetorical aspect, but

⁹² See Pirenne-Delforge 1988 for a discussion of both Aphrodite epithets. She argues that the Platonic opposition disappears when the actual cults are studied, and that the *aitia* for Pandemos suggest she is not so much “la jeune déesse dépravée évoquée chez Platon” but rather “la caution religieuse d’un acte politique et la protectrice du corps civique” (151). She also stresses Aphrodite Pandemos’ political side in 1994, 26-34 and 448-9. I am not entirely convinced by her identification of the statue of Aphrodite dedicated by Kallias (Paus. 1.23.2; *DAA* 152-3 no.136) with Pandemos, which is one of her main pieces of evidence for this characterisation. She does conclude, however, that “Aphrodite *Pandēmos* conservait un lien avec la sexualité, au travers même de son intervention politique” (449).

⁹³ Aristoph. *Lys.* 203-4: δέσποινα Πειθοῖ καὶ κύλιξ φιλοτησία,/ τὰ σφάγια δέξαι ταῖς γυναιξὶν εὐμενής.

⁹⁴ *Lys.* 317, on which the Loeb edition makes this point; both temples are included on a plan of the Akropolis printed at the beginning of the text (1963, Aristophanes III, 4). See Buxton 1982, 44-5 on this passage and on Habrotonon’s invocation of Peitho in Menander’s *Epitrepontes* (555-6), both of which, he argues, combine Peitho’s erotic and her rhetorical side.

⁹⁵ *Frogs* 1391-2: οὐκ ἔστι Πειθοῦς ἱερὸν ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος/ μόνος θεῶν γὰρ Θάνατος οὐ δῶρων ἐρῶ

the traditionalist judge Dionysos dismisses her in her non-intellectual aspect: Death is a weighty matter, but “Persuasion is a light thing and has no sense” — Peitho is a frivolous “bimbo” of a goddess.⁹⁶

By the mid-fourth century we have less equivocal evidence for Peitho’s Athenian cult, with Isokrates and Demosthenes both mentioning state sacrifices to Peitho. Isokrates’ reference to Peitho comes in his *Antidosis* (354/3 BC), in which he is defending himself against the fictitious charge of corrupting youth by teaching them sophistry — a soundly rhetorical context. The Athenians, he says, are hypocritical about eloquence: all covet the ability to think and speak well, but they decry the pursuit of such ability by others; this ambivalence is reflected in their attitude towards Peitho.

But this is a sign not only of their confusion, but also of their neglect of the gods: on the one hand they recognise Peitho as one of the gods, and they see that the city makes a sacrifice to her each year, but on the other they say that men who wish to share in the power which the goddess has are being corrupted, as though they desired an evil thing.⁹⁷

Interestingly, Isokrates describes the Athenians who are jealous of others’ proficiency in rhetoric as suffering “much in the same way as lovers”, but this is not directly connected with Peitho.⁹⁸ There is no other hint of Peitho’s erotic side, and no mention of Aphrodite, but given the context this is hardly surprising.⁹⁹

Aphrodite is also absent from the Demosthenes passage. The reference to Peitho comes in one of his *prooimia*, exemplary opening paragraphs for speeches

⁹⁶ *Frogs* 1396: πειθὼ δὲ κοῦφόν ἐστι καὶ νοῦν οὐκ ἔχον. Translation into the vernacular courtesy of Gideon Nisbet. Buxton misses the appropriateness of Peitho’s erotic side here: “Dionysos’ verdict evidently only makes sense if Peitho is being employed in the sense of rhetorical persuasion” (1982, 43-4). Aristophanes’ characterisation of Euripides here is apt (Buxton 1982, 153), as the Euripidean *peitho*, a force constantly at work, does operate primarily through the medium of speech; Peitho the goddess is almost entirely absent, her one, notable, appearance being in Hekabe’s appeal to Agamemnon, as τὴν τύραννον ἀνθρώποις μόνην (*Hek.* 816), in a thoroughly rhetorical context (Buxton 1982, 178-9).

⁹⁷ Isok. 15.249: ὃ δ’ οὐ μόνον ταραχῆς σημεῖόν ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ὀλιγωρίας· τὴν μὲν γὰρ Πειθὼ μίαν τῶν θεῶν νομίζουσιν εἶναι, καὶ τὴν πόλιν ὁρῶσι καθ’ ἕκαστον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν θυσίαν αὐτῇ ποιουμένην, τοὺς δὲ τῆς δυνάμεως ἥς ἡ θεὸς ἔχει μετασχεῖν βουλομένους ὥς κακοῦ πράγματος ἐπιθυμοῦντας διαφθείρεσθαί φασιν.

⁹⁸ Isok. 15.245: πεπονθέναι παραπλήσια τοῖς ἐρώσι. Metaphors of seduction abound in modern discussions of rhetoric, too: e.g. “Rhetoric is about courtship” (Shanks 1996, 108).

⁹⁹ Parker sees Isokrates as highlighting “the opposite end of the broad spectrum of the goddess’s powers” (1996, 234). Shapiro takes this passage as indicating that Peitho’s cult was “strong” in the fourth century, “for Isokrates condemns it as a sign of the influence of the sophists” (1993, 187).

(c.349 BC), in a list of deities supposed to gain the audience's goodwill by assuring them of divine favour. Peitho is amongst unexpected company:

Indeed, we have sacrificed to Zeus Soter and Athena and Nike, and these sacrifices have been auspicious and salutary for you. We have also sacrificed to Peitho and the Mother of the gods and Apollo and we obtained good omens from these too.¹⁰⁰

The reference to Nike may be explained by the informal usage of the cult title as an abbreviation for the Athena Nike of the sanctuary on the south bastion of the Akropolis, perhaps distinguished here from Athena in her more general role as city patron.¹⁰¹ Otherwise the list seems to be an unexceptional random selection of deities from the Athenian pantheon. Although we can gather little new information about Peitho from this, it does suggest that her cult was of sufficient stature by this period to be included without comment.

Finally, the cults of both Peitho and Aphrodite Pandemos are attested by priest-seats in the Theatre of Dionysos. I have already raised some general problems with these inscriptions as evidence for Athenian cult practice, and discussed the case of “the singer-priestess of Child-nurturing Demeter (and) of Peitho”.¹⁰² Even if the theory that this is a priestess officiating in two neighbouring shrines, rather than indicating a conflation of cults, is correct there is still the problem of Peitho's separation from Aphrodite Pandemos. The latter appears on another seat, “for the priestess of Aphrodite Pandemos (and) of Nymphe ...”.¹⁰³ As Nymphe is “the Bride”, to whom wedding vases are dedicated after the ceremony at her sanctuary just south of the Akropolis, her association with Aphrodite is obvious, although why she should be connected with Aphrodite *Pandemos* is not so clear.¹⁰⁴ Nymphe's sanctuary was

¹⁰⁰ Demosth. *Prooimia/Exordia* 54, 1460: καὶ γὰρ ἐθύσαμεν τῷ Διὶ τῷ σωτήρι καὶ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ τῇ Νίκῃ, καὶ γέγονεν καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια ταῦθ' ὑμῖν τὰ ἱερά. ἐθύσαμεν δὲ καὶ τῇ Πειθοῖ καὶ τῇ Μητρὶ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ ἐκαλλιεροῦμεν καὶ ταῦτα.

¹⁰¹ Mark 1993, 94 and n.6.

¹⁰² Above pp.85-6.

¹⁰³ *IG II²* 5149: [ἱερ]έ[ας Ἀφρ]ο[δίτ]ης Πανδήμου Νύμφης [...]

¹⁰⁴ For various vases found at the shrine, see Oakley and Sinos 1993, 15, 42, 43, 131 n.6 and 137 n.63. See Pirenne-Delforge (1994, 421-6) for a summary of the evidence for Aphrodite's association with marriage. A very tenuous link may be discernible in Pausanias' mention of a cult of Aphrodite Nymphe near “Theseus' Rock” outside Troizen, “which Theseus made when he married Helen” (τῆς δὲ πέτρας πλησίον Ἀφροδίτης ἐστὶν ἱερὸν Νυμφίας, ποιήσαντος Θησέως ἡνίκα ἔσχε γυναῖκα Ἑλένην, 2.32.7). We have seen that Pausanias' reference to Aphrodite and Pandemos (1.22.3) follows on immediately from his mention of Hippolytos' Athenian memorial (1.22.1), the story of Hippolytos and Phaidra, and a digression about Troizen's myrtle trees (1.22.2). Could there possibly be some connection

probably destroyed in the First Mithridatic War, and Pirenne-Delforge suggests that the goddess may have taken refuge in the nearby sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandemos, although our theatre-seat inscription is the only evidence for this.¹⁰⁵ As we have no other information on the Athenian cults of either Peitho or Aphrodite Pandemos in the Hellenistic period after 287/6 BC, the question will have to remain open to conjecture.¹⁰⁶

PEITHO, APHRODITE AND SEDUCTION

A systematic treatment of Peitho's representation in the literature and visual arts of fifth century Athens has already been well supplied by Buxton and Shapiro. However, a few points raised by our discussion of Peitho's cult so far can be usefully amplified by such evidence, in particular the connection between Peitho, seduction and marriage.

In our visual representations Peitho is almost invariably in Aphrodite's retinue. On a white-ground pyxis by the Splanchnopt Painter, of c.450 BC, Peitho is among the welcoming party at the birth of Aphrodite, holding out a phiale ready to pour a libation to the goddess.¹⁰⁷ This scene was most famously rendered, twenty years or so later, on the base of Pheidias' statue of Zeus at Olympia; according to Pausanias (5.11.8) the central figures of the composition were Erôs receiving Aphrodite as she rose from the sea, and Peitho crowning her with a wreath. The only possible appearance of Peitho in extant fifth-century sculpture, however, is on the East Frieze of the temple of Athena Nike, finished in the mid-420s (FIG. 25). This side of the frieze seems to represent a council of the gods, twenty-two figures being just about distinguishable despite fairly bad erosion, with Erôs standing, at the left hand end, between two female figures. One would expect one of these to be Aphrodite, but in the absence of inscriptions Blümel's identification of the figure to the left as Peitho has to remain speculative, although her

between Troizen and the Athenian cult of Aphrodite Pandemos? See Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 178-85 on Troizen and Aphrodite Nymphia, and 410-2 for possible identification of Nymphia's cult statue with the Aphrodite "de Fréjus".

¹⁰⁵ Pirenne-Delforge 1991, 410 n.65 and 1994, 23-4; she also argues for the association of Aphrodite Ourania with marriage (1994, 19-25).

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Apollodoros ap. Harpokration (above) for an implied change of location for Aphrodite Pandemos' cult.

¹⁰⁷ Ancona 3130; *ARV*² 899, 144 and 1674; Shapiro 1993 no.125 fig.160.

inclusion could perhaps be explained by the temple's proximity to the sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandemos and Peitho on the slope below.¹⁰⁸

Returning to vase-painting, at this period Peitho appears in a number of scenes with no apparent mythological narrative, or at least none known to us. A white-ground squat lekythos in Kansas City has Peitho apparently holding out a stick or toy for the baby toddling nearby.¹⁰⁹ It is not entirely clear who the seated woman is (she may be Aphrodite), but three other female figures on the vase are labelled Antheia, Paidia and Eunomia, while Aphrodite and Erôs occupy the upper frieze. Shapiro has gathered together a number of such scenes, especially from the Meidias Painter's circle, where female figures occupied in ordinary "womanly" tasks are identified by inscriptions as personifications, such as Eukleia, Eunomia, Eudaimonia and Paidia; Peitho features in several of these but it is difficult to know what significance should be attached to the various names, if any, when have no story to explain the scene.¹¹⁰ A pelike associated with the Meidias Painter suggests a possible link between Peitho and the persuasive power of music.¹¹¹ Musaïos is seated playing his lyre to an audience of several Muses and Aphrodite and her companions; Peitho sits in the bottom right hand corner, separated from Aphrodite by Terpsichore, muse of dance.

Apart from these non-narrative scenes, Peitho appears most frequently in various stages of the story of Helen. The earliest inscriptionally secure appearance of Peitho that we have is on a fragmentary oinochoe in New York, from the end of the sixth century, potted by Euthymides, depicting the Judgement of Paris.¹¹² Peitho brings up the rear of the procession of contestants, presumably there to help Aphrodite persuade Paris of her right to the prize. This early association of Peitho with Paris continues throughout the fifth century in a number of vase-paintings depicting his seduction of Helen. The "persuasion of Helen" raises the question of Peitho's *modus operandi*: do mortals have any choice when up against her power? Just how forceful can Persuasion be, and when does seduction become rape? In the speech *Against*

¹⁰⁸ Blümel 1950/51.

¹⁰⁹ Kansas City 31.80, c.420 BC; *ARV*² 1248,8; Shapiro 1993 no. 30 fig.164.

¹¹⁰ Shapiro 1993, 203-5.

¹¹¹ New York 37.11.23, 420-10 BC; *ARV*² 1313, 7; Shapiro 1993 no. 48 fig. 165.

¹¹² New York 1981.11.9 + Private collection, c.510-500 BC; *Add.*² 404-5; Shapiro 1993 no.122.

Eratosthenes Lysias makes a good male-chauvinist case for seduction being a more heinous crime than rape:

Thus, gentlemen of the jury, he (the lawgiver) considered that those who use force deserve a lesser penalty than those who use persuasion; for the latter he condemned to death, but for the former he doubled the damages, because he considered that those who achieve their ends by force are hated by the persons forced, while those who use persuasion so corrupt their victims' souls that the wives of others are made more attached to themselves than to their husbands...¹¹³

Peitho's relationship to force is raised by the Meidias Painter's name vase in the British Museum (FIG. 26).¹¹⁴ The principal scene is one of abduction, usually known as the Rape of the Daughters of Leukippos, by the Dioskouroi. In the upper part, Kastor is dragging a reluctant Eriphyle towards his waiting chariot, while Polydeukes, who already has Elera in his chariot, prepares to depart; below, Zeus and Aphrodite look on, apparently unconcerned, while a girl labelled Agave runs off to the left, leaving another picking flowers unperturbed; Peitho starting away to the right, looks back at the scene. Most commentators take this as an example of Peitho representing non-violent methods of persuasion, horrified at the forcible abduction going on, and contrast her righteous indignation to the complacency of Aphrodite, who apparently has no qualms about rape as a means of getting your girl.¹¹⁵ Burn has a point, however, in suggesting that Peitho's alarm "can scarcely be taken seriously".¹¹⁶ In a number of earlier depictions she seems not to be so squeamish, and several literary references suggest that she is not averse to the application of a little force. Pindar talks of "Peitho's whip", and the Peitho of Aischylos' *Agamemnon* is decidedly coercive: "Baneful Persuasion, irresistible child of forward-planning Ruin, forces him...".¹¹⁷ In Herodotos Themistokles threatens the recalcitrant Andrians with the two "great gods" the Athenians have on their side, Peitho and Ananke; Plutarch's version of the story

¹¹³ Lysias *Against Eratosth.* 32-3: οὕτως, ὦ ἄνδρες, τοὺς βιαζομένους ἐλάττονος ζημίας ἀξίους ἡγήσατο εἶναι ἢ τοὺς πείθοντας· τῶν μὲν γὰρ θάνατον κατέγνω, τοῖς δὲ διπλὴν ἐποίησε τὴν βλάβην, ἡγούμενος τοὺς μὲν διαπραττομένους βία ὑπὸ τῶν βιασθέντων μισεῖσθαι, τοὺς δὲ πείσαντας οὕτως αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς διαφθείρειν, ὥστ' οἰκειότερας αὐτοῖς ποιεῖν τὰς ἀλλοτρίας γυναῖκας ἢ τοῖς ἀνδράσι...

¹¹⁴ Red-figure hydria, London E224, c.420 BC; ARV² 1313, 5; Shapiro 1993, no.63 fig. 168.

¹¹⁵ Shapiro 1993, 206; Buxton 1982, 58; Simon 1965.

¹¹⁶ Burn 1987, 17.

¹¹⁷ Pind. *P.* 4.219; though contrast *P.* 9.39 for a Peitho apparently opposed to rape (see Winnington-Ingram 1969). Aisch. *Ag.* 385-6: βιάται δ' ἅ τάλαινα Πειθῶ, / προβούλου παῖς ἄφερτος Ἄτας. Buxton (1982, 105-6) argues that the chorus here have Paris and Helen in mind. The violent Peitho of the *Agamemnon* is replaced in the *Choephoroi* by a Peitho *dolia*, invoked alongside Hermes (726-7). See Buxton (1982, 63-6) on the ambiguous relationship between *peitho* and *dolos*.

pairs Peitho with Bia herself.¹¹⁸ The Meidias Painter's Peitho need not, in fact, be interpreted as abandoning the scene altogether: she balances the figure of Agave, the outward motion of both paralleling that of the chariots in the upper register, and her backward gaze links her with Eriphyle, as if to add her sanction to Kastor's efforts to overcome the last vestiges of resistance. Far from representing an opposition to force, Persuasion's inclusion may rather be part of the scene's romanticisation of the rape into an elopement, introducing the same element of ambiguity as seen in Helen's abduction/elopement with Paris.¹¹⁹

The question of Helen's innocence or guilt was, of course, a popular *topos* in the late fifth century — Euripides absolves her completely in the *Helen*, but in the *agon* scene of the *Trojan Women* his Hekabe makes out a fairly damning case against her. Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen* neatly summarises the case for her innocence, adducing four possible exonerating circumstances in Helen's defence:

So how should one consider the blame of Helen just? Whether she did what she did because she was enamoured <by sight> or persuaded by speech or seized by force or compelled by divine necessity, in every way she escapes the charge.¹²⁰

Although Gorgias does not explicitly personify Peitho, he does earlier on speak of the persuasive word as “a great ruler” (*Enc.* 8), and of divine necessity personified as Tyche and Ananke (*Enc.* 6). There are obvious technical difficulties with representing such abstract forces in visual terms, difficulties tackled in vase-painting by the inclusion of personifications. I think we can take the presence of Peitho and other deities in the scene of Helen's abduction as illustrating, in the mythological terms conventional to art, the various inescapable forces which Gorgias suggests were at work on Helen, from both without and within.

¹¹⁸ Hdt 8.111; Plutarch *Them.* 21. On *peitho* and *bia* as polarities, see Buxton 1982, 58-63.

¹¹⁹ Sutton (1992, 30-1) follows Burn's interpretation, and sees the scene as part of an artistic trend idealising the wedding: “The trauma of a woman's compulsory removal to a new home through arranged marriage is artistically transformed into an agreeable abduction by handsome young heroes set in an idyllic fairyland”; cf. Stewart 1997, 174. On two fourth-century Athenian vases Peitho accompanies Aphrodite among the on-lookers watching another ambiguous rape/marriage, Peleus' struggle with Thetis: fragmentary aryballos now lost, previously Athens, private collection; pelike from Kamiros, 340-30 BC, London E424, ARV² 1475,4 (Icard-Gianolio 1994, nos.10-11*). Icard-Gianolio (1994, 248) follows the usual interpretation of the Meidias Painter's Peitho, as fleeing in horror from violence, but notes that this is exceptional, contrasting her complacency in the two rape-of-Thetis scenes.

¹²⁰ Gorg. *Enc.* 20: Πῶς οὖν δίκαιον ἡγήσασθαι τὸν Ἑλένης μῶμον; ἥτις, εἴτε <ὄψει> ἐρασθεῖσα εἴτε λόγῳ πεισθεῖσα εἴτε βίᾳ ἀρπασθεῖσα εἴτε ὑπὸ θείας ἀνάγκης ἀναγκασθεῖσα ἔπραξεν ἢ ἔπραξεν, πάντως διαφεύγει τὴν αἰτίαν.

An early fifth century skyphos in Boston by Makron depicts two stages in the story, Helen's abduction and her recovery by Menelaos (FIG. 27).¹²¹ Peitho is involved in the first stage, standing behind Aphrodite, holding a flower in her right hand; compositionally she balances Paris' companion Aineas, but thematically her presence underlines and explains the gestures of Paris, Erôs and Aphrodite. This looks like a case of fairly insistent "persuasion", with Helen standing little chance of resisting an almost forcible abduction — note especially Paris' grip on her wrist, and the general feeling of forward motion created by the outstretched arms of Aphrodite and Peitho, and the men's striding posture. A similar scene was probably the subject of a large skyphos by a follower of Douris, thirty years later; a fragment of this, now in New York, preserves the inscribed figures of Peitho, Aphrodite and Erôs, but unfortunately the rest of the scene is lost, so we cannot tell how forceful or otherwise the abduction is, although the figures we do have look rather more still than on the Makron skyphos, their arms by their sides rather than propelling Helen forward.¹²²

The Persuasion of Helen is depicted later on the Berlin amphoriskos already discussed in connection with Nemesis (FIGS. 16 and 28).¹²³ Although the framing pairs of allegorical figures are exceptional, the central scene is a popular motif in red-figure vase-painting of the last third of the fifth century. Over the fifty or so years which divide this from the Makron skyphos a great change of mood has affected the scene: here Helen is not being bundled off to Troy, but is sitting thinking about it. We have at least the illusion that Helen has some choice in the matter, though the odds are stacked against her. She sits on Aphrodite's lap, with Peitho waiting patiently behind holding a jewellery box, while to the right Paris is being urged on by Himeros. A seated Helen with Aphrodite calls to mind the episode in *Iliad* 3 where the goddess, having led Helen to Paris' bedroom, draws up a chair for her; Helen's contempt for Paris, beaten in combat by Menelaos, is quickly overcome by concern for his life, and the scene ends in love-making.¹²⁴ That the Persuasion may well have been the subject of a monumental painting or relief of the fifth century is suggested by the existence of

¹²¹ Boston 13.186, 490-80 BC; *ARV*² 458, 1; Shapiro 1993, no.123 fig.148.

¹²² New York 07.286.51; *ARV*² 806, 1; Shapiro 1993, no. 124 fig. 149.

¹²³ Above pp.107-8.

¹²⁴ *Il.* 3.421-47; this is a reminiscence of Paris' original seduction of Helen. On the elements of wedding imagery in the scene, see Constantinidou, 1990, 57: "the details... present the couple's sexual union as an actual wedding".

three Neoattic reliefs of the first century BC depicting the central scene. The best preserved of these is in Naples, showing Paris and Erôs standing to the right, Aphrodite and Helen seated, and a small Peitho perched on a column to the left.¹²⁵ Iconographically the Persuasion of Helen is related to the generic bridal adornment scene, and Ghali-Kahil comments on the conflation of the two types on a number of vases of the last third of the fifth and the early fourth century.¹²⁶

A later stage in Helen's story, her recovery by Menelaos, is represented on an oinochoe in the Vatican related in style to the Heimarmene Painter, again from about 430 BC (FIG. 29).¹²⁷ Menelaos is charging towards Helen, who is fleeing towards a statue of Athena for asylum, but even as he runs he is being overcome by the combined efforts of Aphrodite, Erôs and Peitho, and has let go of his sword. Apparently Peitho's work is already done, so she is looking away, again holding a flower in her hand.¹²⁸ We might compare this with the *agon* scene of the *Trojan Women* again; of course Euripides' version of this seduction of Menelaos is accompanied by plenty of rhetorical argument, but there are many references to Helen's visual appeal, and it is clear that he will in the end be "persuaded" by her, despite the superiority of Hekabe's logical arguments.¹²⁹ Hekabe's derision of Helen's excuses — "You will not persuade the wise" — is ironic.¹³⁰

¹²⁵ Naples inv. 6628; Vatican Cortile del Belvedere 58d; New York MM 10.210.27. Icard-Gianolio 1994, nos.16-18; for detailed analysis see Froning 1981, 63-71. For a number of other Roman-period works also related to the scene, see Ghali-Kahil 1955, 225-33, nos.170-9, pls. 34-5.

¹²⁶ Adornment scene: Oakley and Sinos 1993, 16-21. Ghali-Kahil 1955, 176. For an example of such a conflation, see my article (Stafford 1997b) on the acorn lekythos attributed to Aison, Akropolis 6471, ARV² 1175, 11 with Beazley *Addenda*² 339. On the general tendency of vase-painting to "interfuse the ordinary and the mythical", see Buxton 1994, 54-6.

¹²⁷ Vatican H 525, ARV² 1173, Ghali-Kahil 1955 no.72 pl.66, c.430-425 BC. Cf. a lekythos by the Painter of Leningrad 702 in the Hermitage (ex-Botkin) for a similar scene, where Erôs hovers with a phiale, instead of a necklace, from which he is pouring the contents on to Menelaos (ARV² 1194, 7, Kahil no.70 pl. 62, 3).

¹²⁸ Simon 1964 discusses this vase at length, arguing that its design is based on one of the metopes from the north side of the Parthenon. She explains Peitho's looking away on the grounds that her gift of eloquence is unnecessary, noting that both literary and artistic representations of the scene make it clear that it was the mere sight of Helen that changed Menelaos' mind. Peitho's non-participation, she argues, is better stressed thus than by omitting her altogether. Understanding Peitho here as representing erotic persuasion is, however, surely the *simplicior lectio*.

¹²⁹ Especially 891-2: ὁρῶν δὲ τήνδε, φεῦγε, μή σ' ἔλῃ πόθω/ αἰρεῖ γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ὄμματ', ἐξαίρει πόλεις... For the visual element of Persuasion, cf. Aisch. *Eum.* 970: στέργω δ' ὄμματα Πειθοῦς; see Buxton 1982, 112-3 on the erotic connotations of eyes.

¹³⁰ Eur. *Tro.* 982 μὴ οὐ πείσης σοφούς. I have just one possible example of seduction being carried out principally through the medium of words: the tondo of a kylix near the Meidias

SEDUCTION AND THE WEDDING

The Persuasion of Helen is the paradigmatic adulterous seduction for fifth century Athens, and Peitho's involvement in it underlines her potentially subversive nature. Paradoxically, Peitho also has a role in the eminently conservative institution of the wedding. Buxton comments briefly on Peitho's role as marriage deity in connection with the Artemis cult at Argos, contrasting this with what he sees as "her role as patroness of *hetairai*".¹³¹ In their articles on Peitho, Voigt manages to read nuptial significance into the inscription from Mylasa, and Weizsäcker has a paragraph on Peitho as "Ehegöttin", under the general heading of "Peitho's significance for civic life".¹³² None of these, however, makes the connection between this institutional role and the seductive Peitho of the visual arts.

A number of late literary references present Peitho in this light. In Nonnos' *Dionysiaka* Peitho, "in the form of a hard-worked woman", leads Kadmos to his bride Harmonia; she is θαλαμηπόλος, "attendant in the bridal chamber", and "delighting in weddings, nurse of Loves".¹³³ In a later episode she is γαμοστόλος, "wedding-preparing", and arms Dionysos and Poseidon, who are preparing to fight for Beroë's hand in marriage.¹³⁴ The general association of Peitho with Hermes we have seen from Hesiod on is articulated in Nonnos' mythology as a husband-wife relationship.¹³⁵ The epithet γαμοστόλος is otherwise usually attached to Hera or Aphrodite, as in the *Orphic Hymn to Aphrodite*, where Aphrodite is "wedding-preparing mother of Loves,

Painter, c.410 BC, Getty Museum 82.AE.38. This shows a seated woman, labelled Demonassa, apparently being lectured rather earnestly by the female figure standing in front of her, while an Erôs stands behind. Marion True (1985, 79-88) identifies the speaker as Peitho because of her pose, overlooking the fact that Peitho does not usually *look* as though she is engaged in rhetorical persuasion, and equates Demonassa with the Demonassa who accompanies Phaon, the ferryman of Lesbos, on a hydria in Florence (81947). I would like to retain the identification of Peitho, since the way Erôs is standing with his hand on Demonassa's shoulder, in collaboration with the speaker, does seem to suggest that some kind of seduction is going on, but I would prefer to think of Demonassa as the daughter of Amphiaraos (Paus. 5.17.5, 9.5.15), perhaps being persuaded against her better judgement to marry her future husband Thersander, son of Polyneikes (who repeated his father's trick of bribing Eriphyle to send first Amphiaraos, then her son Alkmaion, to war against Thebes).

¹³¹ Buxton 1982, 35, based largely on the putative link between Peitho and *hetairai* at Olynthos (above pp.130-1) and Pindar's Corinthian prostitutes, "servants of Persuasion" (fr.122 S-M). Pirenne-Delforge takes the qualification ἀμφίπολοι Πειθοῦς to be merely "joli" (1994, 113); see 10-27 on Akrokorinth's Aphrodite and the question of sacred prostitution.

¹³² Mylasa: above p.129. Voigt 1937, col. 195; Weizsäcker 1909, col. 1810.

¹³³ Nonn. *Dion.* 3.84-6, 112: τερπομένην δὲ γάμοισι τιτηνῆταιραν Ἐρώτων.

¹³⁴ Nonn. *Dion.* 42.530. See Peek 1968-75, s.v. Πειθῶ.

¹³⁵ Nonn. *Dion.* 5.574-5, 48.231-2.

enjoying the marriage bed (with/of) Peitho”, as well as “bridal fellow-diner of the gods”.¹³⁶ Kollouthos has Peitho attending a wedding: “and Persuasion came, who had decorated a bridal wreath”.¹³⁷ More direct reference to Peitho’s involvement in actual wedding ritual is supplied by a sixth-century epigram by Joannes Barbokallos, which purports to record a rustic bridegroom’s offerings:

Hermophilas the herdsman, bridegroom of budding-wreathed Eurynome,
dedicated curds and honey-combs from the hive to Peitho and the Paphian.
Receive the curds for her sake, the honey for mine.¹³⁸

That Peitho’s presence here is not just a literary conceit is suggested by two passages in Plutarch. The second of his *Roman Questions* asks why five torches are lit as part of the marriage ceremony, the last of several possible answers being:

Or is it because they think those getting married need five gods, Zeus Teleios, Hera Teleia, Aphrodite and Peitho, and besides all these Artemis, whom women in childbirth and labour-pains invoke?¹³⁹

Although the context is supposedly Roman, the details are all concordant with Classical Greek practice: Hera the Fulfiller is regularly the presiding goddess of marriage, with Zeus consecrating the union’s legitimacy and legal status; Aphrodite’s role in the ἡμερόεντα... ἔργα γάμοιο is established as early as the *Iliad* (5.429);¹⁴⁰ Artemis must be placated by young women leaving her sphere for marriage, or they risk death in childbirth.¹⁴¹ For Peitho’s function *after* the wedding we have an explanation elsewhere in Plutarch:

¹³⁶ Hera *gamostolos*: Pisand. ap. schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 1748 (vol. III p. 407 Dindorf). *Orphic Hymn to Aphrodite* 55.8-9 and 11: γαμοστόλε μήτερ Ἑρωτων,/ Πειθοῖ λεκτροχαρῆς... νυμφιδία σύνδαιτι θεῶν.

¹³⁷ Koll. 30: καὶ στέφος ἀσκήσασα γαμήλιον ἤλυθε.

¹³⁸ A.P. 6.55: Πειθοῖ καὶ Παφίᾳ πακτὰν καὶ κηρία σίμβλων/ τᾶς καλυκοστεφάνου νυμφίος Εὐρυνόμας/ Ἑρμοφίλας ἀνέθηκεν ὁ βωκόλος· ἀλλὰ δέχεσθε/ ἄντ’ αὐτᾶς πακτὰν, ἄντ’ ἐμέθεν τὸ μέλι.

¹³⁹ Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 264b: ἢ ὅτι πέντε δεῖσθαι θεῶν τοὺς γαμοῦντας οἴονται, Διὸς τελείου καὶ Ἥρας τελείας καὶ Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Πειθοῦς, ἐπὶ πᾶσι δ’ Ἀρτέμιδος, ἣν ταῖς λοχείαις καὶ ταῖς ὠδῖσιν αἱ γυναῖκες ἐπικαλοῦνται. On the *Roman Questions*, see Boulogne 1994, 77-88 (on marriage) and 118-24 (on Plutarch’s conflation of Greek and Roman deities).

¹⁴⁰ On Aphrodite and marriage see Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 421-6. She glosses Peitho’s presence in the Plutarch: “Peitho facilite le passage de la jeune mariée de la maison de son père à celle de son époux” (421), but without explaining why.

¹⁴¹ Burkert 1985a, 133 and 135 (Hera), and 151 with nn.24-5 (Artemis). The garments of those who had died in childbirth were dedicated at Brauron: Eur. *IA* 1464-7; cf. temple inventories, *IG II²* 1514-16. Peitho does not seem to have found her way into the Roman pantheon. She is not listed by Axtell, and the few references to her as *Suada* or *Suadela* are decidedly literary: Ennius *Ann.* 308 (Skutsch), Cic. *Brut.* 15.58-9, Hor. *Ep.* 1.6.38.

The ancients worshipped Hermes alongside Aphrodite, since communication is very necessary for happiness in marriage, and Persuasion and the Graces, so that couples might persuade each other to do what they want, and not fight or be contentious.¹⁴²

While this is obviously a rationalisation, it brings us back to the combination of Peitho and the Charites seen in Hesiod, and the Thasian, Parian and Lesbian cults.¹⁴³ For Peitho's involvement in the wedding itself we must return to fifth century Athens and the evidence of vase-painting.

There have been hints of wedding ritual in several of the vases already mentioned, which bear interesting comparison with Oakley and Sinos' illustrations of the *Athenian Wedding*.¹⁴⁴ Without the inscriptions marking it as a Persuasion of Helen, the central scene of the Berlin amphoriskos would be a generic bridal adornment scene. On Makron's skyphos Paris leads Helen by the wrist with the gesture of a groom leading his bride to her new home, while Aphrodite adjusts Helen's veil, like the bridesmaids (*nympheutriai*) in many wedding scenes.¹⁴⁵ On the fragmentary New York skyphos which probably depicted the same scene, Peitho is pulling at her *himation* in a gesture often associated with the *anakalypteria*, the unveiling of the bride.¹⁴⁶ On a lekythos in London Peitho prepares a *kanoun* for Aphrodite, which could again be a wedding reference, as such baskets appear in a number of wedding scenes, though they seem to have been used in other rituals as well.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴² Plut. *Praec. Coniug.* 138d: οἱ παλαιοὶ τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ τὸν Ἑρμῆν συγκαθίδρυσαν, ὥς τῆς περὶ τὸν γάμον ἡδονῆς μάλιστα λόγου δεομένης, τὴν τε Πειθὴ καὶ τὰς Χάριτας ἵνα πείθοντες διαπράττωνται παρ' ἀλλήλων ἃ βούλονται, μὴ μαχόμενοι μηδὲ φιλονεικοῦντες.

¹⁴³ Cf. Plut. *Erotikos* §6 for the pairing of *peitho* and *charis* in the context of marriage. Plutarch's view of marriage is at least partially influenced by contemporary romanticisation of the institution: see Swain 1996, 118-31.

¹⁴⁴ Oakley and Sinos 1993. Oakley (1995, 66) comments that wedding iconography is appropriate for Helen as she is "the mythological bride *par excellence*"; see fig. 8 for Helen in a bridal adornment scene (kylix, name-vase of the Painter of Berlin F 2436, c.430 BC).

¹⁴⁵ Oakley 1995, 65. On the gesture *cheir' epi karpō* and abduction in wedding imagery, see Jenkins 1983. The groom leads the bride by the wrist in Oakley and Sinos 1993 figs. 82, 85, 87, 94, 97, 102, 106, 10 and 118, in most cases attended by a *nympheteria* adjusting her veil/urging her forward. Oakley and Sinos take Peitho's presence on Makron's skyphos as an indication of divine intercession, suggesting that the bride here is going willingly, negating the idea of violent abduction (33).

¹⁴⁶ On the *anakalypteria*, see Oakley and Sinos 1993, 25 with nn.17-18.

¹⁴⁷ Manner of the Meidias Painter, 410-400 BC, London E697; ARV² 1324, 45; Shapiro 1993, no.21 fig. 163.

The Eretria Painter's epinetron in Athens, of 425-20 BC, may go some way towards explaining Peitho's involvement with institutional unions (FIG. 30).¹⁴⁸ Three scenes are depicted: on the end, Peleus pursues Thetis, and on one side Alkestis is visited by friends after her wedding night.¹⁴⁹ On the other, a bridal adornment is in progress: the bride is seated in the centre, attended by three women, while a friend or her mother is seated to left; there are two winged youths who provide ample indication of the erotic context. Inscriptions identify the bride as Harmonia, her mother as Aphrodite, and the three standing females as Peitho, Kore and Hebe; the youths are Erôs and Himeros. Of course, these are all familiar mythological names, and Aphrodite really is Harmonia's mother, but this is a unique combination of the characters.¹⁵⁰ Shapiro makes a good case for an allegorical reading of the scene:¹⁵¹ the good bride-to-be (Harmonia) is being encouraged by the experienced Aphrodite, with the help of Persuasion, to leave behind her maidenhood (Kore) and enter properly into her prime (Hebe); in other words we have here the traditional pre-marriage instruction session, the bride being decked out with sexual knowledge as well as with such trappings as jewellery and perfume.¹⁵²

Oakley and Sinos comment on the striking emphasis in extant vase-painting on two parts of the wedding ceremony, the procession and the bride among her friends, either preparing for the wedding or receiving gifts after the wedding night.¹⁵³ While

¹⁴⁸ Athens NM 1629; *ARV*² 1250, 34 and 1688; Shapiro 1993, no.47 fig. 58.

¹⁴⁹ See Oakley and Sinos 1993, 41-2 figs. 128-30. Their identification of the Alkestis frieze as an *epaulia* scene (the bride is leaning against the doorway to a bedroom) makes sense of the whole vase as depicting three stages in the wedding process, each associated with a different mythical heroine.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Aisch. *Suppl.* 1038-42 for the combination of Aphrodite, Pothos, Harmonia and Peitho in the context of marriage properly conducted, as contrasted to the forced union of the Danaids with the sons of Aigyptos. Similarly, in the *P.V.* Prometheus' happy marriage to Hesione involves *peitho* (560), in contrast to the unhappy plight of Io, raped by Zeus (Buxton 1982, 86-7 and 99).

¹⁵¹ Shapiro 1986, 14-20; more briefly, Shapiro 1993, 105-6, no. 47 fig. 58.

¹⁵² Peitho is not often involved in the seduction of a man (the only other example I know of is Menelaos' change of heart on the Vatican oinochoe), but she does assist in the persuasion of Adonis, on a rather unusual relief oinochoe, St. Petersburg 108K, c.400 BC; Shapiro 1993, no.131 fig. 167 (for good reproduction of the inscriptions, see Icard-Gianolio 1994, no.20*). Like the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, this is an exceptional case, the seduction of a mortal man by a goddess, and the goddess of love at that. Adonis is placed in the position of the hesitating Helen or inexperienced bride, Erôs and Peitho softening him up to receive his ardent lover. Peitho appears in an unexpected Orphic genealogy which makes her and Erôs parents of Hygieia (Proklos, *in Tim.* p.158e = 2.63.29, 64.2, Diehl); should this be taken to mean that willing participation in sex leads to healthy offspring?

¹⁵³ Oakley and Sinos 1993, 44. The preparation and the *epaulia* scenes are often difficult to distinguish.

the public procession dominates earlier wedding imagery, a shift in favour of the more private parts of the ceremony can be seen in the last third of the fifth and the early fourth century, perhaps to be explained by the general trend towards escapism in vase-painting of this period, or by an increasingly romantic view of the wedding. The motifs of adornment, emphasising the bride's entry into the sphere of Aphrodite, can be read as elements of seduction, an interpretation emphasised by Peitho's occasional inclusion: "we must think of the bride not only as being the target of persuasion but also as acquiring the power represented by this divine figure."¹⁵⁴ Oakley and Sinos' conclusion that the "seductive" element of Athenian wedding imagery reflects a less passive view of women than traditionally held may be a little optimistic, but the essential point, that seduction and the wedding are not mutually exclusive categories, is an important one.

CONCLUSION

To summarise: our earliest evidence for the cult of Peitho outside Athens is the fifth-century inscription from Thasos; at Sikyon the cult may be a late fourth-century innovation; in the Hellenistic period we have reasonable attestations for Paros, Mylasa, and Olynthos. At Pharsalos an elusive inscription indicates an Aphrodite Peitho, possibly associated with marriage, and Peitho appears again as a cult title of Aphrodite at Knidos and on Lesbos in the Hellenistic period; that she is not a separate deity in the last two places could be explained by the importance of Aphrodite's cult there, the old goddess incorporating Persuasion among her many aspects. At Argos we hear of a cult of Artemis Peitho of uncertain date. For Attika a reasonable case can be made for a cult of Peitho at Athens, in association with Aphrodite Pandemos, from at least the late fifth century. The "epithet theory" is at first sight tempting, given Peitho's appearances both as a title of Aphrodite and as an independent goddess, but in no single location do we have evidence of a chronological sequence from the one to the other. Rather than trying to impose such a linear-development model, a more sensible approach is perhaps to see Peitho as generally closely associated with Aphrodite, but

¹⁵⁴ Oakley and Sinos 1993, 46. In literature women who "persuade" men may be regarded with some suspicion — Homer's Hera deceiving Zeus (*Il.* 14.214 ff.), Hesiod's Pandora (above), Pindar's Corinthian prostitutes (above) — but Hera and Pandora both do so within the context of marriage. See above on Argos for Peitho herself as a wife.

the exact nature of the relationship being subject to local variations, and expressed differently according to medium.¹⁵⁵

This association with Aphrodite is Peitho's most consistent characteristic in cult and in the visual arts. In literature she very occasionally appears in a more political context — Alkman's sister of Eunomia and Tyche, Herodotos' story of Themistokles and the Andrians — but these references are heavily outweighed by her appearances in the erotic sphere.¹⁵⁶ Buxton's brief account of "secular *peitho*" in literature from Homer to Plato suggests a shift from an archaic erotic and "bewitching" persuasion to a later Classical emphasis on *peitho*'s rhetorical side.¹⁵⁷ That the abstract concept should develop in this direction is hardly surprising in the context of the growth of the sophistic movement and the opportunities for rhetoric provided by Athens' political and legal institutions. The goddess can indeed occasionally be seen to share in this rhetorical aspect, but only in literary accounts — Pausanias on the cults at Sikyon and Argos, Aristophanes' sophistic Euripides, Isokrates on Athenian attitudes towards eloquence — which are predisposed to favour the persuasive power of the word. For Peitho's much commented-upon association with Artemis, rather than Aphrodite, in the Peloponnese we are entirely dependent on Pausanias. The antiquity of the cults at Sikyon or Argos is open to question, but the latter at least may be explained by the common connection of both Artemis and Peitho with marriage, as suggested by Plutarch. The bulk of our evidence for actual cult practice suggests that Peitho was primarily worshipped as an associate of Aphrodite, and even Aphrodite's epithet Pandemos at Athens is as susceptible to erotic as to "democratic" explanations. As late as the theatre-seat inscriptions Aphrodite Pandemos seems to have some connection with Nymphe, the Bride, and Peitho's appearances in fifth-century Attic vase-painting involve her in the seduction of Helen, in imagery taken from representations of the wedding. Peitho may have "no other temple but *logos*" for Aristophanes' Euripides, but clearly her significance for the majority of her worshippers lay in the far from "logical" sphere of love and marriage.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Pirenne-Delforge's conclusion (1994, 456).

¹⁵⁶ Alkman fr. 64 Page, Hdt 8.111f. See Buxton 1982, 36-45 for a survey. The Peitho of the *Oresteia* is much cited as political in character, but her magical/erotic side is just as apparent; see Buxton 1982, 105-13; Gross 1985, 16-19.

¹⁵⁷ Buxton 1982, 48-57.

Chapter 5

HYGIEIA: “NON DEA SED DONUM DEI”?

Health, greatest of the blessed gods, may I live with you
for the rest of my life, and may you be a willing inmate of my house.
For if there is any joy in wealth or children,
or in a king's godlike power over men,
or in the desires which we hunt with Aphrodite's hidden nets,
or if any other delight or rest from labours
has been revealed by the gods to mortals,
it is with your help, blessed Health,
that all things flourish and shine to the Graces' murmuring.
Without you no one is happy.

Ariphron, *Hymn to Hygieia*¹

Ariphron wrote his hymn to Hygieia around 400 BC, and its long-lasting appeal is attested by the fact of its inscription on stelai from Athens and Epidauros, as well as by citations in writers as late as the Middle Ages.² On the Athens stele, of c.AD 200, now in Kassel, it is inscribed between hymns to Asklepios and Telesphoros, while on the Epidauran stele Hygieia's hymn is followed by hymns to Asklepios and Athena.³ The latter is one of a pair of stones on which six hymns are inscribed, and since one is headed ὥρα τρίτη Bremer suggests these may have formed a “breviary-on-stone” for daily worship. Certainly the hymn, with all its literary refinement, must have been in official cult use, while in Athenaios it appears in a more domestic context, sung as the equivalent of a prayer at the end of a meal.⁴ Less well preserved is the Chian Likymnios' hymn, more or less contemporary with

¹ Ariphron, ap. Athen. 15.702:

Ἵγίεια, πρεσβίστα μακάρων, μετὰ σοῦ ναίοιμι τὸ
λειπόμενον βιοτᾶς, σὺ δέ μοι πρόφρων σύνοικος εἶης·
εἰ γάρ τις ἢ πλούτου χάρις ἢ τεκέων·
ἢ τᾶς ἰσοδαίμονος ἀνθρώποις βασιληίδος ἀρχᾶς ἢ πόθων,
οὓς κρυφίοις Ἀφροδίτας ἄρκυσιν θηρεύομεν,
ἢ εἰ τις ἄλλα θεόθεν ἀνθρώποισι τέρψις ἢ πόνων ἀμπνοὰ πέφανται,
μετὰ σεῖο, μάκαιρ' Ἵγίεια,
τέθαλε πάντα καὶ λάμπει Χαρίτων ὁάροις·
σέθεν δὲ χωρὶς οὔτις εὐδαίμων ἔφυ.

For my purposes, the only significant variant on this text is the insertion of βροτοῖσι after Ἵγίεια in l.1, “greatest for mortals” (PMG 813).

² Ariphron's date: choregic inscription, IG II² 3092. Citations: see Campbell *Greek Lyric* V Loeb, 1993, 134-7 (most recent edition of the hymn).

³ Athens: IG II² 4533; Kassel, Mus. Schloß Wilhelmshöhe, Bieber 1915 no. 80; Sobel 1990, pl. 1. Epidauros: IG IV.1 132.

⁴ Bremer 1981, 210-11.

Ariphron's, which addresses Hygieia as "Bright-eyed mother, longed-for queen of Apollo's holy throne on high, softly-smiling Health."⁵

From such invocations it would seem that the goddess Hygieia was held in high regard. She was present in the form of statues or votive reliefs, and invoked in inscriptions, in sanctuaries of Asklepios all over the Greek world. Hygieia came to Rome as part of the cult of Aesculapius in 293 BC, where she continued to flourish long after she was officially identified with and absorbed by *Salus* in 180 BC, and evidence of her worship in the imperial period has been found in places as far apart as Rouen and Ptolemais.⁶ But while the cult of Hygieia is amply documented from the fourth century BC on, its origins are obscure, and her consistent dependence on the male Asklepios is a striking feature. Unlike Themis, Nemesis and Peitho, she does not appear in extant literature or art before her earliest attestation in cult, and she has very little mythological role to provide personal characterisation, making her status as a personification the more immediately apparent. Recent studies of Hygieia's iconography and cult make an exhaustive account of the evidence unnecessary here, but this combination of impersonality and widespread worship makes her an interesting case for our investigation.⁷ I shall look in particular at the question of the goddess' origins and her relationship with the concept she embodies.⁸

⁵ Likymnios, ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 49 (PLG⁴ III 599; PMG 769): Λιπαρόμματα μήτερ, ὑψίστων θρόνων/ σεμνῶν Ἀπόλλωνος βασιλεία ποθεινά,/ πραῦγέλως Ὑγίεια (Page reads ὑψίστα).

⁶ Arrival of Asklepios in Rome: Livy 10.47.6-7 (with summary of book 11), Ovid *Met.* 15.626-744. Identification of Hygieia with *Salus*: Livy 40.37.1-3. Continued existence of Hygieia post 180 BC: e.g. a *lex collegi Aesculapi et Hygiae* at Rome in 153 BC (CIL VI 10234; Rome, Vatican 1172; Sobel 1990, pl.1b). Interestingly, the temple of Aesculapius and *Salus* in Lambeasis contained altars to the god and Hygieia, rather than *Salus*. See Edelstein and Edelstein (1975, nos.839-61) on Asklepios' cult in Italy; Axtell (1987, 13-15) on Roman Hygieia, *Salus*, and *Valetudo*.

⁷ Sobel 1990 (see end pages, for maps showing the distribution of Hygieia's cult, as attested by written sources/archaeological evidence) and Croissant 1990; with 238 LIMC entries, Hygieia comes second only to Nemesis amongst personifications in popularity. Hamdorf (1960, 47-8 and 105-6) gives his usual synopsis of the material.

⁸ An early version of this chapter was delivered as a paper at the conference *Hygieia: Good Health in Antiquity*, held at Exeter in September 1994. Amongst the audience there, Karen Stears, Helen King and Veronika Grimm were especially helpful in their comments and suggestions. I owe my references to medical writers to Rebecca Flemming.

“WITHOUT YOU NO ONE IS HAPPY”

A thorough investigation of the word *hygieia* and its usage is beyond the scope of this chapter, but a few definitions from a variety of writers may be useful in establishing what it is that Hygieia represents. In later medical writers *hygieia* is a technical term, opposed to *nosos*, “disease, sickness”, and closely defined as a matter of the correct balance between the elements:

For health and disease come about concerning the powers of the primary bodies from which living creatures are composed, that is the elements, the powers of which are heat, cold, moisture and dryness. For it is in the due proportion of these powers with each other that health consists, and disease consists in the disproportion of these same things.⁹

Galen gives a similar definition at the beginning of the *Hygiene*, but elsewhere comments on the more popular usage of the terms:

I see all men using the nouns *hygieia* and *nosos* thus... For they consider the person in whom no activity of any part is impaired “to be healthy”, but someone in whom one of them is impaired “to be sick”.¹⁰

Plutarch provides an example of such non-technical usage in the course of his account of the meaning of “ox-hunger”, likewise contrasting *hygieia* with *nosos* and perhaps implying that the former is the natural state:

Since any kind of starvation, and particularly *boulimos*, resembles a disease, inasmuch as it occurs when the body has been affected unnaturally, people quite reasonably contrast it (with the normal state), as they do with wealth and disease with health.¹¹

In a medical context, *hygieia* is clearly “soundness of body”, and such *good* health is also implied in more general usage. Non-medical texts go further, like Ariphron, making *hygieia* not only a good thing, but one without which none of life’s other advantages can be enjoyed. The general idea is familiar in the late twentieth century — “He that wants health wants all”¹² — and it seems to have become a commonplace

⁹ Alexander of Aphrodisias *Quaestiones* 1.9; tr. Sharples 1992, 46.

¹⁰ *Hygiene*: Green 1951, 5. *On the Therapeutic Method* 1.5.4; translation Hankinson 1991, 22.

¹¹ Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 6.8 (*Moralia* 694b): ἐπεὶ δὲ πᾶς μὲν ἔοικεν [ὁ] λιμὸς νόσῳ, μάλιστα δ’ ὁ βούλιμος, ὅτι γίνεται παθόντος παρὰ φύσιν τοῦ σώματος, εἰκότως ἀντιτάττουσιν ὥς μὲν ἐνδεία τὸν πλοῦτον ὥς δὲ νόσῳ τὴν ὑγίειαν. Also in this chapter are Plutarch’s accounts of the holocaust to Boubrostis at Smyrna and the Chaironeian “driving out of Ox-hunger” (see below p.193 on Ploutos).

¹² *Penguin Dictionary of Proverbs* (1983, no.87.8).

in Greek literature. Simonides is supposed to have voiced the sentiment that “there is no pleasure in beautiful wisdom if a man does not have holy health”,¹³ and the primacy of health is similarly asserted in a much-quoted drinking song attributed to Simonides or Epicharmos:

To be healthy is best for mortal man,
second is to be of beautiful appearance,
third is to be wealthy without trickery,
and fourth to be young with one's friends.¹⁴

The primacy or otherwise of health as “a good” is explicitly discussed by Sextus Empiricus in *Against the Ethicists*, in the course of an argument as to whether good and evil really exist. In demonstrating that opinions about what is good and what is evil conflict, he uses the example of *hygieia*, a subject particularly familiar to him, since he himself was a physician. He quotes Ariphron, Likymnios and Simonides, in support of the statement “Now, that *hygieia* is a good, and the prime good, has been asserted by not a few of the poets and writers and generally by all ordinary folk.”¹⁵ For an expert opinion he cites Herophilos, the Kean physician, c.300 BC, who “in his *Dietetics* affirms that wisdom cannot display itself and art is non-evident and strength unexerted and wealth useless and speech powerless in the absence of health.”¹⁶ Others, particularly the Academics and Peripatetics, recognise health as *a* good, but not *the* prime good. A “pleasing illustration” of this point of view is attributed to Krantor, a disciple of Xenokrates, c.300 BC. We are to picture a theatre, with the goods entering one by one and competing for the first prize, each presenting a more convincing case than the last. First comes Wealth (ὁ πλοῦτος), then Pleasure (ἡ ἡδονή). Third, Health explains that in her absence there is no profit in pleasure or wealth, quoting Euripides: “What does wealth profit me when I am

¹³ Simonides fr. 604 *PMG* (ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 11.49): μηδὲ καλᾶς σοφίας ἐστὶν χάρις/ εἰ μὴ τις ἔχει σεμνὰν ὑγίειαν. Hamdorf (1964, 47) cites this and Pind. *P.* 3.73 (εἰ κατέβαν ὑγίειαν ἄγων χρυσέαν κῶμόν τ' ἀέθλων Πυθίων αἶγλαν στεφάνοις) as instances of Hygieia's appearance in poetry before 420, but both are rather equivocal cases of personification.

¹⁴ Simon. fr. 146 (*PMG* 651): ὑγιαίνειν μὲν ἄριστον ἀνδρὶ θνητῷ,/ δεύτερον δὲ καλὸν φῶν γενέσθαι,/ τὸ τρίτον δὲ πλουτεῖν ἀδόλως,/ καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ἡβᾶν μετὰ τῶν φίλων.

¹⁵ *Adv. Math.* 11.49: ἀγαθὸν μὲν οὔν, καὶ τοῦτο πρῶτον, εἰρήκασι τὴν ὑγίαν οὐκ ὀλίγοι τῶν τε ποιητῶν καὶ τῶν συγγραφέων καὶ καθόλου πάντες οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ βίου.

¹⁶ *Adv. Math.* 11.50: Ἡρόφιλος δὲ ἐν τῷ διαιτητικῷ καὶ σοφίαν φησὶν ἀνεπίδεικτον καὶ τέχνην ἄδηλον καὶ ἰσχὺν ἀναγώνιστον καὶ πλοῦτον ἀχρεῖον καὶ λόγον ἀδύνατον ὑγείας ἀπούσης.

sick? I would rather live a painless life, having a little day by day, than be rich and suffer sickness.”¹⁷ But last of all enters Courage (ἡ ἀνδρεία), claiming that her presence is essential for the maintenance of all the others, so health ends up with only second place.

For a more populist consideration of *hygieia*’s ranking as a good thing, we might turn to Lucian’s *De Lapsu*. This is ostensibly an apology to a patron for “a slip of the tongue in greeting”: Lucian accidentally said “Health to you” when protocol required “Joy to you”. But he takes the opportunity for a disquisition on the three forms of greeting τὸ χαίρειν, τὸ ὑγιαίνειν and τὸ εὖ πράττειν, giving examples of the usage of each from various philosophers and other writers, as well as adducing supposedly historical instances, to show that wishing someone health in fact encompasses both “joy” and “doing well”. Apparently, Plato rejected “Joy to you” as bad and pointless, substituting “Do well”, while Pythagoras advised his pupils to use “Health to you”. They always began serious letters to one another with it, as “the greeting most suitable for both body and soul, encompassing all human goods”.¹⁸ Epicurus, too, started letters to his dearest friends “Health to you”, and the greeting often comes first in epic, tragedy and Old Comedy. Philemon says, “First I beg good health, and second doing well, thirdly to have joy, and last to owe no debts”.¹⁹ The Simonides drinking song is cited, then the first line of Ariphron’s hymn: “I need hardly mention that most familiar piece of all which is on everyone’s lips... Then if health is greatest of the gods, her work, the enjoyment of health, is likewise to be put before the other goods.”²⁰ One of Lucian’s “historical” examples is Pyrrhos of Epiros: in all his prayers to the gods, he never asked for victory or glory or excessive

¹⁷ *Adv. Math.* 11.56 (Eur. *Telephos* fr. 714 Nauck): τί γάρ με πλοῦτος ὠφελεῖ νοσοῦντά γε;/ μίκρ’ ἂν θέλοιμι καὶ καθ’ ἡμέραν ἔχων/ ἄλυπον οἰκεῖν βίον ἢ πλουτῶν νοσεῖν. Health enters “in company with her fellow deities”, which could perhaps mean Asklepios and other members of her family.

¹⁸ *De lapsu* 5: ὥς καὶ αὐτὸ ψυχῆτε καὶ σώματι ἀρμοδιώτατον καὶ συνόλως ἅπαντα περιειληφὸς τὰνθρωπίνου ἀγαθὰ. Lucian goes on to assert that these Pythagoreans even called the Pentagram, the triple intersecting triangle which they used as a symbol of their sect, “Health”, and some, e.g. Philolaos, called the Quaternion (i.e. the sum of first four integers, 1+2+3+4=10) “the Beginning of Health”.

¹⁹ *De lapsu* 6: αἰτῶ δ’ ὑγίειαν πρῶτον, εἴτ’ εὐπραξίαν,/ τρίτον δὲ χαίρειν, εἴτ’ ὀφείλειν μηδέν.

²⁰ *De lapsu* 6: ἵνα σοι μὴ τὸ γνωριμώτατον ἐκεῖνο καὶ πᾶσι διὰ στόματος λέγω, Ὑγίεια... ὥστε εἰ πρεσβίστη ἐστὶν ὑγίεια, καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῆς τὸ ὑγιαίνειν προτακτέον τῶν ἄλλων ἀγαθῶν.

wealth, but only to be healthy (ὕγιαίνειν); he was sure that if he had this he would easily get all the rest. Lucian comments, “I think he was right when he considered that all the good things in the world are worth nothing when health is the one thing missing.”²¹ He ends his case by suggesting that his slip of the tongue was inspired by Hygieia herself or by Asklepios, in order that his patron might be promised health through him, and prays that Asklepios might accept this composition.²²

The concept Hygieia embodies, then, is good health, physical soundness which is a necessary prerequisite for a good life. This puts her in a rather different conceptual category from “order”, “righteous anger” and “persuasion” — though “health” is grammatically an abstract, it is manifested in extremely tangible forms, of immediate personal interest to everyone. For anyone with a Christian background the deification of such a physical, earth-bound state is particularly difficult to comprehend, and St Augustine’s rationalisation appealing: “she is not a goddess, but a gift of God”.²³

HYGIEIA’S ORIGINS

Hygieia first appears as an autonomous deity in 420 BC when she arrives in Athens with Asklepios; before this her history seems to be divided into two strands, in Athens and in the Peloponnese. A cult of Athena Hygieia seems to have been observed on the Athenian Akropolis from at least the first half of the fifth century.²⁴ A dedication of c.475 BC by the potter Euphronios, found on the Akropolis, is often cited as honouring Athena Hygieia, although the inscription is very fragmentary, and an alternative restoration would make the dedicatee Apollo Paian; in either case it seems just as plausible to read *hygieia* as the concept rather than as an epithet of Athena, in a prayer for health.²⁵ Less equivocal evidence is provided, however, by a

²¹ *De lapsu* 11: καὶ ἄριστα οἶμαι ἐφρόνει, λογιζόμενος ὅτι οὐδὲν ὄφελος τῶν ἀπάντων ἀγαθῶν, ἔστ’ ἂν τοῦ ὑγιαίνειν μόνον ἀπῆ.

²² *De lapsu* 15 and 19. At 13 he points out that the Roman greeting *salve* is equivalent to τὸ ὑγιαίνειν.

²³ *City of God* 4.20; this is actually applied to Virtus, but Health would certainly fall within the category of minor deities lambasted throughout book 4; see above pp.58-9.

²⁴ See above pp.60-1 on the noun-noun combination.

²⁵ *IG* I³ 824, B 4: ...αν [h]υγίεια[ν....]ν.. *DAA* 255-8, no.225. The supposition that this is sound evidence for an early cult of Athena Hygieia persists: e.g. Aleshire 1989, 12 and n.1; Ridgway 1992, 137 and n.62; Shapiro 1993, 125; Robertson 1996, 47. Maxmin ingeniously

vase fragment also from the first half of the fifth century bearing the graffito “Kallis made and dedicated this to Athena Hygieia”.²⁶ Although not much of the vase survives, the image over which the dedication is inscribed could well be an armed Athena: most of the shield can be seen, decorated with a snake, held against flowing drapery. The shield device might call to mind Hygieia’s usual attribute, but snakes are also associated with Athena in her own right. We do not hear of Athena Hygieia again until the 430s, but here we have both a complete inscription and a story to go with it, Plutarch’s account of an accident which happened in the course of Perikles’ building programme on the Akropolis. A workman engaged on the Propylaia fell from a great height, and was so badly injured that doctors despaired of him, but Athena appeared to Perikles in a dream and prescribed a course of treatment, which rapidly healed the man: “It was in commemoration of this that he set up the bronze statue of Athena Hygieia on the Akropolis near her altar, which was there before, as they say.”²⁷ The details of the story, with its combination of divine intervention and practical treatment, probably owe much to the authors’ knowledge of later healing procedures at Epidauros and other Asklepieia, but such a statue was indeed dedicated at around this time. A base found just inside the Propylaia attests a public dedication, rather than a private one by Perikles: “The Athenians to Athena Hygieia. Pyrrhos the Athenian made (this).”²⁸ The base is still *in situ*, next to an altar of the same period, which perhaps replaced an older altar destroyed in the course of the new building work in the 430s. Athena Hygieia appears only rarely after 420 and the arrival of Asklepios with his associate. In the 330s sacrifices to her at the Lesser Panathenaia are recorded as having been funded by taxes levied on the recently recovered territory

links this with Euphronios’ change of career from painter to potter and suggests that the “health” desired might have been a cure for long-sightedness.

²⁶ IG I³ 506 (Athens Akropolis 1367): Ἀθην[αίαι] ὕγιει[αι] Καλλίς/ [ἐ]ποίησ[ε] καὶ ἀνεθ[ηκεν]; ARV² 1556; Wolters 1891, 154-7; Graef and Langlotz 1933, no.1367 and pl.91.

²⁷ Plut. *Perikles* 13.7-8. Cf. Pausanias (1.23.4), who takes care to distinguish between a statue of Hygieia “who people say is daughter of Asklepios” and one of Athena “who also bears the surname Hygieia”. Pliny probably conflates the two: *Pyrrhus (fecit) Hygiam et Minervam* (NH 34.80). Wolters (1891, 159-60) suggests that the statue was perhaps dedicated in thanks at the end of the plague in the early 420s.

²⁸ IG I³ 506: Ἀθηναῖοι τῇ Ἀθηναίᾳ τῇ Ὑγίᾳ. Πύρρος ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναῖος. DAA 185-88 and 523, no.166 (two close-ups of the inscription). See Travlos (1971, 124 fig.170) for a good photograph of the base. Ridgway dismisses the discrepancy as to dedicator as an example of ancient sources preserving a “distorted version of the truth” (1996, 137-8).

of Oropos.²⁹ Elsewhere in Attika Athena Hygieia is only mentioned once, and in passing, by Pausanias, as having an altar at Acharnai.³⁰

It would be interesting to know what this Athena Hygieia looked like. Attempts have been made to identify replicas of Pyrrhos' statue in the type of Athena best known from that in the Hope collection. The main reason for making a connection between the two seems to be that the Hope Athena was found together with statues of Asklepios and Hygieia, as there is nothing obvious in her iconography to suggest the identification: her helmet is decorated with pairs of sphinxes and winged horses, and her aegis has a particularly dense trimming of snakes, features all explicable in terms of Athena's own mythology. The identification has been discredited on technical grounds, as the marks on the base do not fit with the feet of any of the Hope Athena copies.³¹ The cuttings rather indicate that the statue which the base supported had its right foot forward, the left drawn back and turned outwards, with a spear held in the left hand anchored to the base. Robertson has recently suggested that the cult statue of Athena Hygieia should be identified with the Athena Promachos, which in turn should be associated with the striding Athena depicted on Panathenaic amphoras; Pyrrhos' statue would have been a smaller-scale version of this, not striding quite so actively.³² His argument seems to be based largely on an anecdote by Cassius Dio which records that, during the battle of Actium, a statue of Athena on the Athenian Akropolis turned from east to west and spat blood, indicating that the gods favoured Octavian rather than Antony,³³ such a

²⁹ *IG II² 334.8-10*: ... θύειν δὲ τοὺς ἱεροποιοὺς τὰς μὲν δύο/ [θυσίας τήν τε τῇ] Ἀθηνᾶ τῇ ὕγείᾳ καὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ ἁρ-/ [χαίῳ νεῶι θυο]μένην... Humphreys 1985, 208.

³⁰ Paus. 1.31.6. Athena Hygieia appears once outside Attika, though not until the second century AD, at Hieron near Epidauros, in a dedication made by a priest of Asklepios: Ἀθηνᾶ Ὑγείᾳ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Σωτῆρος Ἀσκληπιοῦ Μάρκος Ἰούνιος Δαδούχος (Cavvadias, *Epidaure* 49). Shapiro (1993, 126 n.265) suggests that an altar inscribed with the name Hygieia found in the *temenos* of Athena Pronoia at Delphi might be another instance of Athena Hygieia's cult; its location may be indicated by the conspicuous inscription ὙΓΙΕΙΑΣ on the inside of the *temenos* wall.

³¹ I am indebted to Birte Lundgren for information extracted from her notes for an entry on the Hope Athena in the Ashmole Archive. For a refutation of Studniczka's identification of the Hope Athena with Pyrrhos' statue, see Mathiopoulos 1968, 105-6. Mathiopoulos argues that Pyrrhos' statue was as important a work as the original of the Hope/Farnese type, which inspired the production of many replicas.

³² Robertson 1996, 47-8; he perhaps dismisses the difference in stance too lightly. Athena Promachos: Paus. 1.28.2; schol. Demosth. *Against Androtion* 13.

³³ Cassius Dio 54.7.3.

statue, he maintains, ought to be out of doors (to make the most of the orientation point) and spitting blood suggests an association with Hygieia. Plutarch's account, however, seems to imply that the statue of the 330s was erected next to an altar which had previously stood by itself, and while it *may* be possible to associate the Athena of Panathenaic amphoras with an outdoor sanctuary and statue, it is difficult to see what her connection would be with Hygieia.³⁴

For the Peloponnese, we have two testimonies to Hygieia's existence before 420, a fact which has led some to postulate that she originated in this area as an autonomous deity who became associated with Asklepios because of their similarity of function.³⁵ But we have very little to go on, and what we do have already associates Hygieia with Asklepios. Pausanias lists statues of Hygieia and Asklepios among the series of statues by Dionysios of Argos which stood along the south side of the temple of Zeus at Olympia. These were dedicated by Mikythos (treasurer of Anaxilas tyrant of Rhegion, later regent for his children) around 460 BC, apparently in thanks for a miraculous cure brought about by prayer at Olympia.³⁶ At Titane, in the northern Peloponnese, there was an Asklepieion supposed to have been established by Alexanor, son of Machaon and grandson of Asklepios. Pausanias describes the statue of Asklepios as very ancient, dressed in a white woollen tunic and cloak, and that of Hygieia as being almost hidden by the swathes of "Babylonian clothing" and masses of women's hair offered to her.³⁷ Such clothed statues and offerings might indicate a cult of greater antiquity than the fourth century, and the account implies that it was popularly observed.³⁸ That the cult of Hygieia was well established in this locality by the end of the fifth century is suggested by the fact that Ariphron, author of our hymn, came from Sikyon, just a few miles away from Titane. He calls her *πρεσβίστα* (l.1) another possible indication of her antiquity, though given the context this may mean "most important" rather than "oldest" of the gods.

³⁴ See Neils (1992, 36-7) for the attribution of such a sanctuary to a "Panathenaic Athena".

³⁵ See Croissant 1990, 554.

³⁶ Paus. 5.26.2; cf. Hdt. 7.170 on Mikythos.

³⁷ Paus. 2.11.6: φαίνεται δὲ τοῦ ἀγάλματος πρόσωπον μόνον καὶ ἄκραι χεῖρες καὶ πόδες. χιτῶν γὰρ οἱ λευκὸς ἐρεοῦς καὶ ἱμάτιον ἐπιβέβληται. καὶ Ὑγείας δ' ἔστι κατὰ ταῦτόν ἀγάλμα· οὐκ ἂν οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἴδοις ῥαδίως, οὕτω περιέχουσιν αὐτὸ κόμαι τε γυναικῶν αἱ κείρονται τῇ θεῇ καὶ ἐσθῆτος Βαβυλωνίας τελαμῶνες.

³⁸ On dressing statues, see Romano 1988.

The two strands come together with Hygieia's arrival in Athens in the wake of the Epidaurian Asklepios in 420 BC, an event recorded on the Telemachos Monument, which gives an exceptionally detailed account of the founding of the cult. From fragments found on the site of Asklepios' sanctuary on the south slope of the Akropolis, the monument can be reconstructed as consisting of a tablet carved with reliefs on both sides, supported by a pilaster with inscriptions and reliefs on all four sides (FIG. 31a). On the main relief Asklepios is shown standing, to the right, with a female companion seated on a table, beneath which crouches a dog; a smaller-scale figure to the left, his hand raised in a gesture of prayer, must be a human, quite plausibly Telemachos himself (FIGS. 31b).³⁹ The presence of the dog may be paralleled by the animal's association with the hero in his sanctuaries at Epidauros and the Peiraeus.⁴⁰ The larger male figure is recognisable as Asklepios on iconographic grounds, being bearded and semi-draped, but the female is without distinguishing attributes. The identity of both, however, can be inferred from the account of Telemachos' contribution to the cult's foundation inscribed on the one reasonably well-preserved side of the pilaster (FIG. 31c):

Telemachos founded the sanctuary and altar to Asklepios first, and Hygieia, the sons of Asklepios and his daughters and... Coming up from Zea during the Great Mysteries he (Asklepios) was conveyed to the Eleusinion; and having sent for servants at his own expense, Telemachos brought him (Asklepios) here on a wagon, in accordance with an oracle; at the same time came Hygieia; and so the whole sanctuary was established in the archonship of Astyphilos of Kydantidai....⁴¹

³⁹ Fragments of relief, side A: i) Hygieia (?): Athens NM 2477 and London BM 1920.6-161; ii) Asklepios: Padua Mus. Civ.; iii) Telemachos (?): Verona, Mus. Maffeiano. See Beschi 1982 for a full discussion of the fragments and reconstruction of the monument. He shows Mitropolou's 1975 reconstruction and identification of the two divine figures as Aminos and a companion to be unsound. The relief on side B Beschi interprets as recording Asklepios' journey from Epidauros via the Piraeus to Athens in symbolic terms, depicting a ship and waves on the right, on the left the propylon of the new Asklepieion.

⁴⁰ Thrasympedes' chryselephantine cult statue of Asklepios at Epidauros had a dog lying at its side (Paus. 2.27.2). Dogs and *Kynagetai* are among the recipients of bloodless sacrifice specified in a fourth-century *lex sacra* from the Peiraeus Asklepieion (IG II² 4962 a.8-10; see below n.91).

⁴¹ IG II² 4960 fr.a.1-20 (SEG XXV 226; Athens EM 8821): [Τ]ηλέμαχος ἰδ[ρύσατο τὸ ἱε]ρὸν καὶ τὸν βα[μὸν τῷ Ἀσ/σκλ]ηπιῷ πρῶτος καὶ Ὑγι/είαι, τοῖς Ἀσ[κλ]ηπιάδαι/ς καὶ τ[αῖς Ἀσ[κλ]ηπιῶ θυγ/ατράσιν] κα[ὶ].../...../..../... ἀνελθὼν Ζεόθ[ε]ν Μυστηρίοις τοῖς μεγάλ[οις] κατηήγετο ἐς τὸ Ἑλ[ευσίνιον]· καὶ οἴκοθεν/ [μεταπεμ]ψάμενος διακ[ό]νος ἡγ[α]γεν δεῦρε ἐφ' ἄρματος Τηλέμαχο[ς] κα[τ]ὰ χρησμ[ό]ς· ἅμα ἦλθεν Ὑγ[ί]εια καὶ οὕτως ἰδρύθη/ [τὸ ἱερὸν] τόδε ἅπαν ἐπὶ [Ἀστυφί]λο ἄρχοντα[ς] Κυ[δαντί]δο. I am following the text proposed by Clinton, based on his own examination of the stone (1994b, 21-5).

It has been generally held that Asklepios travelled in the form of a snake, but Clinton has recently made a good case for the alternative restoration of the inscription adopted here, and suggests that both Asklepios and Hygieia took the more orthodox form of statues, eventually to be put up in the new sanctuary.⁴² This journey from the Piraeus was commemorated annually thereafter by the Epidauria, held on the 17th Boedromion, a conveniently empty day in the midst of the older festival of the Eleusinian Mysteries.⁴³ Clinton demonstrates that the connection with Epidauros was not only emphasised by the festival's name, but also by the regular participation of officials from Epidauros; this he connects with the important role of Eleusinian officials in bringing Asklepios to the Eleusinion, and possibly previously to Zea, which Telemachos' account carefully down-plays, stressing rather that his own part in the proceedings had the approval of Delphi.⁴⁴ A second festival, the Asklepieia, was held on the 8th Elaphebolion, the day of the "Preliminary to the Contest" at the beginning of the City Dionysia, although we have little information on this.⁴⁵ Asklepios must have been known in Athens long before 420,⁴⁶ but it is only with Telemachos' formal introduction that the cult begins to be observed, and the sanctuary with which it is associated probably remained essentially private for the first fifty to seventy-five years of its existence, not receiving state funding until the mid fourth century.⁴⁷

The Telemachos Monument is also the first time Hygieia is seen in Athens as a goddess separate from Athena. As we have seen, Hygieia was probably already associated with Asklepios in the Peloponnese, and is attested at Epidauros at least as early as the turn of the fifth to the fourth century. Clinton argues against the idea of

⁴² Clinton 1994b, 23-4. Such "ancient images (*aphidrymata*)" of Asklepios and Hygieia are referred to in a decree from the Athenian Asklepieion of 52/1 BC (*IG II²* 1046.13-14).

⁴³ Philostratos *Vita Apollonii* 4.17; Paus. 2.26.8. Parke 1977, 63-5.

⁴⁴ Clinton 1994b. On the introduction of Asklepios' cult to Athens, see also Garland 1992, 116-35; Parker 1996, 175-85.

⁴⁵ Aischines 3.67; *IG II²* 1496.109-10, 133-5, 150; *SEG XVIII*.26.11 (restored).

⁴⁶ In the *Iliad* Asklepios is of course father of the physician heroes Machaon and Podaleirios, leaders of the contingent from Trikkha, Ithome and Oichalia. Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* (frs. 50-2 M.W.) apparently told the story of Asklepios' life, and a fuller version appears in Pindar *Pythian* 3.25-60. On the Homeric Asklepios see Walton 1894, 1-7; Kerényi 1956, 70-86; Edelstein and Edelstein 1975, II 1-22.

⁴⁷ On the history of the Athenian Asklepieion, see Aleshire 1989, esp. 7-20. On the practice of dedication there and the economic status of the dedicants, see also Aleshire 1992.

an Epidaurian origin for the Athenian Hygieia on the grounds that the Telemachos inscription implies that her statue only joined Asklepios' after he left the Eleusinion.⁴⁸ Even if such a literal interpretation is accepted, however, it would not necessarily mean that Hygieia must have come from a local Athenian source; both the inscription and the relief above it rather associate Hygieia closely with the explicitly imported cult of Asklepios. That sacrifices were still being made to Athena Hygieia in the 330s also undermines the hypothesis that the Hygieia of the Telemachos Monument was in some way a development from the Athenian Athena Hygieia.⁴⁹ The closest we have come to seeing the "epithet theory" at work is the case of Aphrodite and Peitho, and unlike them Athena and Hygieia do not seem to remain closely associated, the independent Hygieia's primary relationship being with Asklepios. It can also not be coincidental that Hygieia appears for the first time in Athenian vase painting in the last two decades of the century (see below).⁵⁰

That Athens' patron goddess should have included healing among her many attributes is not particularly surprising,⁵¹ but if the independent Hygieia's origins lie outside Attika, how did she come into being? Most problematic is her complete lack of early mythological pedigree providing a foundation upon which a cult could be established. Her consistent association with and dependence on Asklepios suggest that she derived from him in some way, but exactly how is difficult to establish in the absence of more evidence for her pre-420 existence.⁵² It is not impossible that Hygieia originated purely in iconographical invention, as a useful means of

⁴⁸ Clinton 1994b, 24 n.22.

⁴⁹ As e.g. Farnell 1896-1909, I 317-8.

⁵⁰ The Epidauros link is also reflected on an Attic red-figure plate of 420-10, where a personified Epidauros is shown holding the baby Asklepios, accompanied by another female figure Eu(kleia?), and approaching a seated Eudaimonia; a tripod on top of an Ionic column in the background probably alludes to a victory in a dithyrambic contest, presumably with a poem recounting Asklepios' birth. Leuven, Katholieke Universiteit; Shapiro 1993, 65-6 no.20; Schefold 1981, 57-8 fig. 70.

⁵¹ Farnell 1896-1909, I 317: "the Athenians in this as in other matters attribut[ed] to their goddess all that tended to the physical amelioration of life".

⁵² Hygieia never possessed a temple of her own anywhere, and she rarely had even so much as an altar to herself. At Epidauros a temple was built for Egyptian Hygieia, Asklepios and Apollo by "the senator Antoninus" (Pius?), but she did not even have a shared temple there before this (Paus. 2.27.6).

representing Asklepios' "product", but her success as a deity far exceeds that of any other born of such a deliberate device.⁵³

HYGIEIA'S ASSOCIATES

If Hygieia's early history is obscure, her associations with other deities from 420 on provide a more promising line of enquiry. In the first half of the fourth century she seems to have been associated with Demeter at Metapontum: a stater has a head identical to contemporary issues representing Demeter, but on the neck, in tiny letters, is the inscription *HYΓIEIA*.⁵⁴ It is tempting to make much of the allegorical implications — a good crop/plentiful food ensures good health — but a simpler explanation would be to see Hygieia here as a property of Metapontum's principle deity, parallel with Athena Hygieia. The closest we get to *hygieia* or a cognate being used of a male divinity is a Dionysos *Hygiates*, "Dispenser of Health", attested in Athenaios, quoting the fourth-century medical writer Mnesitheos. The fragment is a passage on the beneficial properties of wine, if taken in moderation, as giving strength to mind and body, and being useful in medicine, for mixing with drugs. It ends with the comment, "Because of this Dionysos is everywhere called physician (ἰατρός)", to which Athenaios adds, "The Pythia has told some to call Dionysos ὑγιάτης."⁵⁵ But it is not at all clear that either ἰατρός or ὑγιάτης were ever official cult titles; once the medical properties of wine have been adduced it is almost inevitable that the giver of wine should be described as "doctor".⁵⁶ In the context of Dionysos as healer, Athenaios also quotes the fourth-century comic poet Euboulos, who puts a speech on how much wine should be provided at a party into Dionysos' mouth. The fragment stands in a long tradition of sympotic poetry on the subject of the dangers of excessive drinking and the pleasures of a moderate intake:

⁵³ Edelstein and Edelstein (1975, 89-90, n.51) summarise the arguments for and against Hygieia being "an Athenian creation" or "an emanation of Asklepios".

⁵⁴ Croissant 1990, 219*; Sobel 1990, X.1; Noe 1984, no.411 (cf. no.420 for a Homonoia).

⁵⁵ Mnesitheos fr. 41 Bertier (ap. Athen. 2.36a-b). Cf. Mnesitheos fr. 42 (ap. Athen. 1.22e) for the oracle recorded by Chamaileon: "For twenty days before the Dog-star (rises) and twenty days thereafter, use Dionysos ἰατρός in a shady house. Mnesitheos of Athens, also, says that the Pythia directed the Athenians to honour Dionysos as ἰατρός." See Bertier (1972, 57-86) on the Mnesitheos fragments, and Fontenrose (1978, 392, L103) on the oracle.

⁵⁶ Bertier 1972, 61. On Dionysos as healer, see Detienne 1989, 38.

For sensible people I prepare only three kraters: one for health (*hygieia*), which they drink first; another for love and pleasure; and a third for sleep. After draining the third, those said to be wise go to lie down. The fourth I know not. It belongs to insolence (*hybris*). The fifth is full of cries. The sixth brims with insults and jests. The seventh has black eyes. The eighth is the bailiff, the ninth, bile. The tenth is madness (*mania*). It is this one that causes stumbling. For poured into a narrow receptacle it easily trips up the one who drinks it.⁵⁷

Dionysos the giver of health, pleasure and sleep, stands aside after the beneficial first three kraters, leaving the intemperate to bring trouble upon themselves. That the first krater is “for Health” would suggest the common toast to Hygieia, attested by numerous references to the Ὑγιείας μετανιπρίς (“cup of Health”) in literature of the fourth century and later: “one shook the great cup, full half with wine, half with water, calling on the name of Health.”⁵⁸

Hygieia is occasionally associated with the healing hero Amphiaraos, especially at Oropos, his major cult centre, where she appears several times either alone or in company with the hero. According to Pausanias, she shared the fourth division of the great altar of the Amphiareion with Panakeia and Iaso, Aphrodite and Athena Paionia.⁵⁹ This may well have influenced the Athenian cult of Amphiaraos after Oropos was handed over to Athens post-Chaironeia, and Hygieia seems to have had a place in the Athenian Amphiaraion in the 330s: one of the charges against Euxenippos defended in Hypereides’ speech is that he allowed Olympias, the Macedonian queen-mother, to make a dedication to the statue of Hygieia there.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Hunter 1983 fr. 94 (= PCG V, Eubulus fr. 93): Τρεῖς γὰρ μόνους κρατῆρας ἐγκεραννώω/ τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσι· τὸν μὲν ὑγιείας ἕνα,/ ὃν πρῶτον ἐκπίνουσι, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον/ ἔρωτος ἡδονῆς τε, τὸν τρίτον δ’ ὕπνου,/ ὃν ἐκπίνοντες οἱ σοφοὶ κεκλημένοι/ οἴκαδε βαδίζουσ’. ὁ δὲ τέταρτος οὐκ ἔτι/ ἡμέτερός ἐστ’, ἀλλ’ ὕβρεος· ὁ δὲ πέμπτος βοῆς/ ἔκτος δὲ κῶμων· ἑβδομος δ’ ὑπωπίων· ὁ δ’ ὄγδοος κλητῆρος· ὁ δ’ ἑνατος χολῆς/ δέκατος δὲ μανίας, ὥστε καὶ βάλλειν ποιεῖ/ πολὺς γὰρ εἰς ἓν μικρὸν ἀγγεῖον χυθεὶς/ ὑποσκελίζει ῥᾶστα τοὺς πεπωκότας. From the play *Semele or Dionysos*; tr. Detienne 1989, 50. See Athen. 2.36c-37b for further passages on wine, Hybris and Ate.

⁵⁸ Philetairos fr. 1 Austin (ap. Athen. 11.487a): ἐνέσεισε μεστήν ἴσον ἴσῳ μετανιπρίδα μεγάλην, ἐπειπὼν τῆς Ὑγιείας τοῦνομα; from fourth-century comedy *Asklepios*. Cf. Kallias fr. 9 PCG IV (ap. Athen. 11.486f; from *Cyclops*); Nikostratos frs. 3 and 19 K. (ap. Athen. 11.487b; from *Anterosa*); Antiphanes fr. 147 PCG II (ap. Athen. 10.423d; from *Melanion*); Kallimachos fr. 203.20-22 Pfeiffer. Pollux explains: “the μετανιπρίς was actually a kylix, which they took after washing their hands. The name comes from the use of the cup rather than its shape. It was sacred to Hygieia, just as the krater was sacred to Zeus Soter” (6.100).

⁵⁹ Paus. 1.34.3; see Schachter 1986, 60-1.

⁶⁰ Hyp. *Eux.* 12: δεινὰ γὰρ ἐποίησεν περὶ τὴν φιάλην, ἐάσας Ὀλυμπιάδα ἀναθεῖναι εἰς τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς Ὑγιείας. See Mitchell 1970, 24 n.99 for the argument that Euxenippos was an

Hygieia's main relationship, though, is with Asklepios and his family. Given the lack of any mythological stories connected with Hygieia, the idea that she is part of a "family" seems somewhat anomalous, and things are not made any easier by the ambiguous status of Asklepios himself. In Homer he is a hero; most versions of his story make him son of Apollo by a mortal woman, and have him eventually struck down by Zeus.⁶¹ Heroic status may be alluded to in the iconography of the Telemachos Monument, and Athenian *Heroa* are attested in the second century BC.⁶² Like Herakles, however, he is "un-heroic" in the geographical extent of his cult, and divine status is suggested by his other festivals, even explicitly attributed to him by some sources.⁶³ Ambiguity of status can also be seen in his "family", which regularly consists of two hero sons, Machaon and Podaleirios, and four or five goddess daughters, Hygieia, Iaso, Panakeia, Akeso and sometimes Aigle. A wife, Epione, "the Mild" is occasionally mentioned, but is impossible to distinguish from the daughters in visual representations without the aid of an inscription; her name is explained by one commentator as having been conferred διὰ τῆς ἡπίου φαρμακείας, "because of her soothing medicines".⁶⁴ It would seem that the daughters are a late addition, corresponding to Asklepios' acquisition of divine status; the only pre-fourth-century testimonia to mention them are a fragment of the comic poet Hermippos, quoted in a scholion on Aristophanes' *Ploutos*⁶⁵ and the *Hippocratic Oath*, where Hygieia and Panakeia are coupled, without any of their sisters, in the opening invocation.⁶⁶ Also, while the sons have "proper" names, unconnected with their role as physicians, the daughters are named after aspects of Asklepios' work: Hygieia and Panakeia are personifications of abstract nouns meaning "health" and "cure-all"; Iaso and Akeso are slight variations on the nouns

official of Hygieia's cult at the Amphiaraion, having set up cult statue himself. Cf. Humphreys (1985, 219) on the influence of the Oropos cult.

⁶¹ See above n.46 for references.

⁶² Beschi draws attention to the chthonic associations of the dog, featured on both sides of the relief (1982, 42). *Heroa*: IG II² 974.12 (SEG XVIII 26.12), 137/6 BC.

⁶³ For belief in Asklepios' divinity, see Paus. 2.26.8; Edelstein and Edelstein 1975, nos.232-65 and II 76-91.

⁶⁴ Cornutus, *Theol. Gr. Comp.* 33.

⁶⁵ Hermippos fr.73 Kock (schol. Aristoph. *Plout.* 701): ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἑρμιππος ἐν τῷ [πρώτῳ] ἰάμβῳ τῶν τριμέτρων Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ Λαμπετίας τῆς Ἥλιου λέγει Μαχάονα καὶ Ποδαλείριον καὶ Ἰασὼ καὶ Πανάκειαν καὶ Αἶγλην νεωτάτην. Hygieia is notably absent.

⁶⁶ *Hippocratic Oath*: ὁμνυμι Ἀπόλλωνα ἱητρὸν καὶ Ἀσκληπιὸν καὶ Ὑγίαν καὶ Πανάκειαν καὶ θεοὺς πάντας τε καὶ πάσας...

ἰασις and ἄκεσις, both meaning “healing” or “cure”. Even Aigle means “the Light of the Sun”, suggesting an association between healing and light.⁶⁷

One of the earliest fourth-century sources to mention any of these goddesses is Aristophanes’ *Ploutos* itself, of 388 BC. Wealth is taken to a sanctuary of Asklepios for his blindness to be cured, and when during the night the god does the rounds of his patients, he is attended by Iaso and Panakeia; there is no mention of Hygieia.⁶⁸ The anonymous Erythraean hymn to Asklepios of c.370 BC, however, explicitly lists his children by Epione: Machaon, Podaleirios, Iaso, Aigle and Panakeia, “along with bright Hygieia the glorious”.⁶⁹ Bremer comments, “This whole catalogue serves a double purpose, that of situating the god in his happy family and thus honouring him, and also that of enumerating the effects of the god’s medical powers”.⁷⁰ A more or less contemporary votive relief from Thyreatis in the northern Peloponnese shows Asklepios with two male and four female deities, who could reasonably be identified as this family, though the figures are not given names (FIG. 32).⁷¹ One of the goddesses, in very low relief, appears immediately behind Asklepios, while the remaining three are separated from him by their two brothers: most people see her as Hygieia, in a position of “second-in-command” to Asklepios. Certainly she has first place behind Asklepios, before his other five children, a hundred years later in the opening prayer of Herodas’ fourth *Mimiamb*, which dramatises a sacrifice to Asklepios on Kos.⁷²

⁶⁷ See Kerényi 1956 *passim* for the light/dark opposition in connection with Asklepios. He even defends Wilamowitz’ etymology, which derives “Asklepios” from “Aigle” (Kerényi 1956, 28-9 and n.15). See Edelstein and Edelstein (1975, II 85-89) on Asklepios’ daughters as props for the hero’s newfound divine status.

⁶⁸ Aristoph. *Ploutos* 701-3, 730-2; schol. *ad* 639 includes Hygieia amongst “the many children of Asklepios”. Alan Griffiths suggests that Hygieia is perhaps seen as “coming later”, once the healers’ work is done, on the analogy of the Litai following Ate in *Iliad* 9. There is some debate as to which Asklepieion is meant, that on the Akropolis or the one in the Peiraeus, though the latter seems more likely: Aleshire 1989, 13. See Clinton for the suggestion that the sanctuary at Zea was established by the Eumolpidae and Kerykes, perhaps as much as a year before Asklepios’ progression into Athens, and in 388 BC was still more popular than the privately-founded Akropolis sanctuary (1994, 24, 30 and 34).

⁶⁹ *Paeon Erythraeus* 14-5 and 23-4: σὺν ἀγακλυτῷ/ εὐαγελί Ὑγιείαι. On the hymn, see Edelstein and Edelstein 1975, I no. 592, II 200. A first century AD hymn to Asklepios by Makedonios follows similar lines, adding Akeso to the list of Asklepios’ daughters and calling Hygieia ἀριπρέπτος and τερπνοτάτη (*IG* II² 4473.17, 20).

⁷⁰ Bremer 1989, 209.

⁷¹ Athens NM 1402, c.370-60 BC. Hausmann 1948, no.7; Sobel 1990, II.44; Kerényi 1956, fig. 47; Krug 1993, fig. 50.

⁷² Herodas *Mimiamb* 4.5.

The other daughters do not seem to have acquired anything like Hygieia's stature, appearing far less frequently in reliefs and cult-related documents; Aristeides even comments that Hygieia is the "counterpoise of all the others".⁷³ At Athens, in particular, it is Asklepios and Hygieia who receive sacrifices together by the middle of the third century:

... it is the ancestral custom of the physicians who are in the service of the state to sacrifice to Asklepios and to Hygieia twice each year on behalf of their own bodies and of those they have healed...⁷⁴

THE PICTURE OF HEALTH

From his study of Hygieia's appearances in vase-painting, Shapiro concludes: "All of the sources that connect Hygieia to Asklepios as his daughter and make her a subsidiary aspect of his cult are considerably later than the fifth century. In the earlier period, the two seem to have been on much more of an equal footing..."⁷⁵ But this totally ignores the many reliefs of the late fifth and fourth centuries which almost certainly depict Hygieia in just this subsidiary role, and as nearly all the vases he considers are by the Meidias Painter, or closely associated, they can hardly be taken as widely representative. These are, however, some of the earliest representations of Hygieia we have, and are the only context in which she appears independently of Asklepios, so are worth considering.

The Meidias Painter's name-vase has already been mentioned for its depiction of Peitho fleeing from the Rape of the Leukippidai in the main scene.⁷⁶ Below this

⁷³ Arist. *Or.* 38.22: ἡ πάντων ἀντίρροπος. Croissant dismisses Hygieia's sisters as "simples allégories exprimant la fonction médicale d'Asclépios" (1990, 554). This is going too far, as there is some evidence for their cult, albeit scanty. E.g. a votive relief of around 340 BC, has an enthroned Asklepios surrounded by four female figures, three standing and one seated, identified by an inscription as Akeso, Iaso, Panakeia and Epione: Athens NM 1352, *IG II²* 4388; Hausmann 1948, no. 147; Kerényi 1956, fig. 23. See Hausmann 1948, nos. 79-89, 123 and 147-158 for reliefs representing Asklepios with sons/daughters other than Hygieia. Pausanias describes the sanctuary of Asklepios in Athens as worth seeing for the statues of "the god and his children" (1.21.4), but does not specify which. See above for the altar at Oropos.

⁷⁴ *IG II²* 772.9-13: πατριόν ἐστὶν τοῖς ἰατρο-ῖς ὅσοι δημοσιεύουσιν θύειν τῷ Ἀσκ-/ληπιῷ καὶ τεῇ Ὑγιείᾳ δις τοῦ ἐνιαυ-/τοῦ ὑπὲρ τε αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν σωμάτων ὧν ἔ-/καστοι ἰάσαντο. Cf. *IG II²* 974 (138/7 BC) for a priest of Asklepios and Hygieia and sacrifices "at the beginning of the year". On the role of the public physicians in the cult of Asklepios, see Aleshire 1989, 94-5.

⁷⁵ Shapiro 1993, 128.

⁷⁶ Hydria, London BM E224, c.410 BC. Croissant 1990, no.1*; *ARV²* 1313, 5; *Para* 477, *Add²* 361; Burn 1987, M5 pls.1a, 2b-3; Sobel 1990, l.2; Shapiro 1993, no. 63 fig. 79.

runs a frieze of eighteen standing and seated figures, the main group on the front depicting Herakles in the Garden of the Hesperides, while the others are an eclectic assortment, including four of the Attic eponymous heroes, Medea and Philoktetes. Hygieia sits on a rock, holding a long sceptre, looking over her shoulder at three Hesperides (named Asterope, Chrysothemis and Lipara) picking apples from a tree up which a snake twines (FIG. 33). Though unprecedented, it is quite appropriate that Hygieia should be depicted in this mythological setting, since the apples of the Hesperides were meant to confer youth and immortality upon their possessors, and Herakles' own apotheosis and marriage to Youth associates him with immortality. The snake in the tree seems a harmless version of the traditional guardian dragon, but also calls to mind the attribute associated with Hygieia in other media, and of course Asklepios' snake-entwined staff. The juxtaposition of Hygieia with the local heroes is perhaps a deliberate reference to Athens' recent adoption of her cult, showing her integration into the city's pantheon.⁷⁷

Two more hydriai by the Meidias Painter, both in Florence, represent a pair of lovers surrounded by onlooking personifications, including Hygieia. Aphrodite and Adonis are watched by Paidia, who sits on Hygieia's lap, with Eutychia, Eudaimonia and Himeros.⁷⁸ Phaon and Demonassa are accompanied by various members of Aphrodite's retinue, including Himeros and Pothos pulling a chariot, and Eudaimonia, who leans on Hygieia's shoulder.⁷⁹ Two pyxides in the manner of the Meidias Painter include Hygieia among other personifications in "women's-quarters" scenes. One in New York has Peitho, Hygieia, who holds a pot and a jewellery box, and Eudaimonia, along with Paidia, Eukleia and Aponia.⁸⁰ One in London has Aphrodite and her chariot, to which Pothos and Hedylogos are yoked, Hygieia picking fruit, and Eunomia, Paidia, Eudaimonia, Himeros, Harmonia and Kale

⁷⁷ See Burn 1987, 15-25. She explains the presence of Medea by her association with rejuvenation, and interprets the whole frieze as an "Attic paradise". A similarly peaceful version of Herakles in the garden of the Hesperides can be seen on one of the three-figure reliefs, the original of which was probably roughly contemporaneous with the Meidian vase and may well have adorned a public monument; for the relief, see below p.229, FIG. 60.iii.

⁷⁸ Florence 81948, from Populonia, c. 410 BC. Croissant 1990, no.2*; *ARV*² 1312, 1; *Para* 477, *Add*² 361; Burn 1987, M1 pls.22-5a; Sobel 1990, I.7 (she erroneously catalogues this as Florence 81947); Shapiro 1993, no.16 fig. 81.

⁷⁹ Florence 81947, from Populonia, c. 410 BC. Croissant 1990, no.3*; *ARV*² 1312, 2; *Para* 477, *Add*² 361; Burn 1987, M2 pls. 27-9; Shapiro 1993, no.17 fig. 80.

⁸⁰ New York 09.221.40, c.410 BC. Sobel 1990, I.6; Shapiro 1993, no.1 fig. 83.

(FIG. 34).⁸¹ A squat lekythos in London, again in the manner of the Meidias Painter, has a much smaller cast: Eudaimonia sits in the central position, where we would expect Aphrodite herself; she is attended by Pandaisia, “Wedding Feast”, while to the right stands a youth called Polykles, presumably the groom, and to the left Hygieia, presumably as bride (FIG. 35). She is raising a fold of her himation, in a gesture which is often taken to signify modesty, or in this context is likely to refer to the *anakalypteria*, the unveiling of the bride.⁸²

What are we to make of this Hygieia? The Meidias Painter offers a feast for the allegorist. Children’s “Play” is good for their “Health”, or at least dependent upon it. Hygieia’s most constant association is with Eudaimonia, “Good Fortune”, once reinforced by Eutychia, which points to the uncertainty of the blessings of Health. The appearance of Hygieia on pyxides, containers for jewellery or cosmetics, and her carrying of a jewellery box, ties in with her association with both Aphrodite herself and the goddess of love’s various assistants. The fruits of love, acquired with the help of “Persuasion”, “Desire”, “Yearning” and “Sweet-Talk”, cannot be enjoyed without good Health. More prosaically, Hygieia is depicted on hydriai, from which fresh water is poured, while Health characterises herself in one instance by picking fruit. But can we take this at all seriously? Without the inscriptions, we would never be able to distinguish one Meidian personification from another, and their sheer abundance makes it difficult to attach major significance to any one figure. In her monograph on the Meidias Painter, Lucilla Burn explains their function as promoting a general atmosphere of well-being, their multiplicity consolidating the amount of happiness on offer in an escapist paradise.⁸³ I am inclined to agree that Hygieia should be understood as merely part of this general “feel-good” impression, but the important point remains that Health is represented as one of life’s major *desiderata*. It seems odd that Hygieia should be divorced from her usual association with Asklepios on a group of representations dating from the years immediately after her introduction to Athens in his wake.

⁸¹ London E775, c.400BC. Sobel 1990, I.4; Shapiro 1993, no.19 fig. 82.

⁸² London E698, from Ruvo, c.400 BC. Croissant 1990, no.52; *ARV*² 1316; *Add*² 362; Burn 1987, P1 pl. 20c-d; Sobel 1990, I.3; Shapiro 1993, no.18 fig. 84.

⁸³ Burn 1987, 36. See 32-40 on Meidian personifications in general. For a political interpretation of the figure of Aponia NY 09.221.40, see Shapiro 1984.

The only vase outside this Meidian circle which shows Hygieia is a Boiotian krater, of about 400 BC (FIG. 36).⁸⁴ Here she is straightforwardly associated with Asklepios, and represented as receiving a worshipper, which would accord with evidence of her cult in Boiotia.⁸⁵ On one side, Hygieia is seated to the right, and in front of her a woman brings offerings. On the other, Asklepios reclines on a couch, offering a kantharos of drink to a snake. Hygieia is a particularly appropriate figure to decorate a vessel for mixing wine, given the association we have already seen between health and wine, and the universal toast “your health”, *στην υγειιά σας*.⁸⁶

A considerable number of votive reliefs of the late fifth and fourth centuries depict Asklepios with a single female deity in attendance. This figure could be his wife or one of the other daughters, but she is usually identified as Hygieia, since other sources give Hygieia preeminence in Asklepios’ family. The god himself is recognisable by being bearded and semi-draped, and obviously the identification is more secure if the relief is known to come from a sanctuary of Asklepios. A snake is the attribute of both father and daughter. One of the earliest of these reliefs, dating from c.415 BC, probably comes from the Athenian Asklepieion, and is now in Brocklesby Park, Lincolnshire (FIG. 37).⁸⁷ Worshippers approach Asklepios, who holds out a phiale in his right hand, and behind him stands Hygieia carrying a small vase, perhaps meant to contain medicine. From the Peiraeus Asklepieion comes a more homely scene of healing (FIG. 38).⁸⁸ A woman lying on a couch is being attended by Asklepios, just as though he were a mortal doctor, while three adults and a child look on. Behind Asklepios stands a rather casual-looking Hygieia, holding a fold of her cloak in a gesture similar to the one we noted on two of the Meidian vases

⁸⁴ Athens NM 1393, c.400 BC. Croissant 1990, no.7*, cf. *LIMC* II s.v. Asklepios 41*; Lullies 1940, 21-2, pl.26, 1-2; Sobel 1990, I.1. Not mentioned in Shapiro 1993.

⁸⁵ For references to Boiotian cults of Hygieia, see Schachter 1986, II 60-1.

⁸⁶ Above pp.170-1.

⁸⁷ Brocklesby Park 10; Croissant 1990, no.137 = Asklepios 102*; Hausmann 1948, no.3 pl.13; Sobel 1990, II.60.

⁸⁸ Peiraeus Museum 405, end 5th cent. BC. Croissant 1990, no.138; Hausmann 1948, no.1 pl.1; Sobel 1990, II.80; Kerényi 1956, fig. 18. Croissant suggests Iaso and Panakeia as well as Hygieia as candidates for the goddess, but gives no justification for the identification, which would be required in the case of the first two given their relative obscurity. Cf. the relief depicted on side B of the Telemachos Monument (Beschi 1982, 41-2 fig. 9).

(London hydria and squat lekythos). If this reflects a real doctor's visit, perhaps Hygieia here is in the role of ἰατρίνη, female doctor or midwife, standing aside for the more authoritative male doctor.

Moving into the fourth century, three fragmentary reliefs from the Athenian Asklepieion have the combination of a seated Asklepios and Hygieia leaning against a column, stele or tree. On one, Asklepios was seated to the left, though only his feet are still extant, while Hygieia leans against a column, up which a snake climbs.⁸⁹ The column presumably indicates that the scene is set inside Asklepios' temple. The second has a man and a boy offering a pig to the enthroned Asklepios (FIG. 39).⁹⁰ There is a snake coiled under the god's seat and Hygieia stands leaning with her right arm against a tall stele topped with a disc. The third depicts a family bringing offerings of fruit and cakes, which they place on an altar before the seated Asklepios (FIG. 40).⁹¹ Hygieia leans against a tree up which a snake climbs, rather reminiscent of the snake in the Hesperides frieze on the Meidias' Painter's London hydria. In this connection we might call to mind one of the cures recorded at Epidauros: a mute girl was sleeping in the abaton when she saw a snake creeping down from one of the trees which grew nearby; on waking up she immediately cried out for her mother and father, and went away cured.⁹²

These offer us a fairly consistent image of Hygieia as Asklepios' chief assistant. Her subordinate status is indicated by her position, standing behind the god, or by the fact that she remains standing while he is seated. But she is present on nearly half of the reliefs we have, and seems to be sharing in the offerings brought, which would suggest that her role in Asklepios' cult is a substantial one.⁹³

⁸⁹ Athens NM 2557, first half 4th cent. BC. Croissant 1990, no.29*; Hausmann 1948, no.143; Sobel 1990, pl.4a.

⁹⁰ Athens NM 1330, c.350 BC. Croissant 1990, no.31; Hausmann 1948, no.144; Sobel 1990, II.36 pl.4b; Kerenyi 1956, 38 fig. 21.

⁹¹ Athens NM 1335, c.330 BC. Croissant 1990, no.34 (= *LIMC* II s.v. "Asklepios" 96*); Hausmann 1948, no.145; Sobel 1990, II.40; Kerenyi 1956, 33 fig.16. A fourth-century inscription from the Peiraeus Asklepieion lists a number of healing deities to whom three πόπανα must be given as a "preliminary", presumably to a blood sacrifice *IG* II² 4862; see Kearns 1994, 68.

⁹² *IG* IV² I.123 xlv.

⁹³ Hausmann 1948 catalogues 52 reliefs showing Asklepios alone, 72 showing him accompanied by Hygieia, 21 with other members of his family, and 14 with other deities or heroes.

By far the largest body of representations of Hygieia, however, is made up of statues associated with the cult of Asklepios. For the most part these are Roman copies of fourth century originals, and fall into half a dozen or so main iconographic categories, though there is little to choose between most of them. As a rule, Hygieia is represented as a young woman, of more or less demure aspect, standing with a snake draped around her shoulders, which she feeds from a *phiale*. Variations occur in matters such as which leg her weight is on, which hand holds the *phiale*, details of drapery and hairstyle, and just what the snake is doing, but the essential remains the same.

Probably the most familiar image of Hygieia is the statue from the Hope collection, currently in the Getty Museum, Malibu (FIG. 41).⁹⁴ This Antonine-period copy was found at Ostia, together with the Hope Athena and Asklepios. The statue has been compared to Kephisodotos' "Eirene and Ploutos", which it resembles both in formal aspects and in its conception, as a figure which appears at once allegorical and human.⁹⁵ The Attic origin suggested by this similarity, combined with a date in the first half of the fourth century and the wide dissemination of the type, has led to the suggestion that the original was the cult statue of the Athenian Asklepieion, but we have no written sources to confirm this or identify a sculptor; Aleshire rejects the idea, arguing that the statue of Asklepios stood alone in his temple.⁹⁶ For once, the statue has a head, though various elements have been restored: the nose, the right forearm and *phiale*, the left hand and nearby drapery, and parts of snake.

From the second half of the century, Pausanias records the existence of a statue group by Skopas in the temple of Asklepios at Gortys in Arcadia, representing Hygieia and a young, beardless Asklepios.⁹⁷ A small-format group in the Vatican is thought to be a Roman adaptation of this, the bearded head of Asklepios being a

⁹⁴ John Paul Getty Museum, Malibu (on loan since 1973 from LA County Mus. of Art, no.50.33.23). Croissant 1990, no.160; Sobel 1990, III.1 pl.5a; Waywell 1986, 68-9, fig. 10 pl.47. See Waywell also on Hope Athena (67-8, pl.46 fig. 9) and Asklepios (69-71, pl.48,1 fig. 10). For a photograph of the Hope Hygieia taken when the restorations were removed during conservation work in 1974, see Vermeule 1981, no.48.

⁹⁵ See Croissant (1990, 570) for a resumé of literature on the original of Hope type. See below pp.190-4 on Kephisodotos.

⁹⁶ Aleshire 1991, 43-4; see pl.11 for a reconstruction of the interior of the temple's cella.

⁹⁷ Paus. 8.28.1.

modern addition.⁹⁸ Also by Skopas, again according to Pausanias, were the statues of Asklepios and Hygieia which stood either side of that of Athena Alea in her temple at Tegea.⁹⁹ A head in Athens, found at Tegea, has long been labelled as belonging to this Hygieia, but in fact is more in the style of Praxiteles and likelier to belong to an Aphrodite than a Hygieia.¹⁰⁰

A type well attested by reproductions in all categories of document is the Broadlands, part of a group and regularly associated with an Asklepios of the Eleusis type (cf. the Thyrea relief), the latter being securely dated by a dedication of Epikrates to c.320 BC. The statuette from Rhodes was found with a young, but bearded, Asklepios (FIG. 42).¹⁰¹ The Broadlands is in fact only a variant of a statue-type known from an example in New York, datable to c.330, which has nothing to identify it as representing Hygieia. The sculptor of the Broadlands Hygieia has adapted this simply by lightly modifying the arm movement in order to add the snake. It is probable that the original was part of the group sculpted by Timarchos and Kephisodotos the Younger for the sanctuary of Asklepios on Kos.¹⁰² The style of the best replicas and the date of c.320 (imposed by the Epikrates dedication and the relationship with the New York statue) fit perfectly with this identification, which explains the considerable popularity of the type.

Any deity is only recognisable by his or her attributes, or sometimes special clothing, but with more mythologically established figures than Hygieia identification is often aided by a narrative setting. Hygieia has no stories attached to her, standard female drapery, and just the one attribute. This paucity of clues to her identity is brought out by the case of a statue in Kassel (FIG. 43 i-ii). The type was originally created for Hera c.420 BC, possibly by Agorakritos, but was much favoured by the Romans and used, with minor adaptations, both to represent various goddesses and

⁹⁸ Vatican Mus. 571, imperial period. Croissant 1990, no. 22*; Sobel 1990, pl.3b; Amelung 1908, II pl.51 fig. 399. Of the same type is a group in Copenhagen, which has a beardless Asklepios (Croissant 1990, no.21).

⁹⁹ Paus. 8.47.1.

¹⁰⁰ Athens NM 3602; Sobel 1990, III.g.12. For firm refutation of the head's identity as Hygieia, see Croissant 1990, 571.

¹⁰¹ Rhodes Mus. Arch., Konstantinopoulos 1977, fig. 170; Croissant 1990, no.72; Sobel 1990, III.d.5 pl.11b.

¹⁰² New York statue: Richter, *MetrMusSculpt*, no.126 pl.96. See Croissant (1990, 571) for a summary of the arguments and bibliography.

for portraits; the mere addition of a snake has given us a Hygieia. Until very recently it sported a head, with which it appears in most of the literature on the statue, including the 1990 volume of *LIMC* which covers Hygieia.¹⁰³ The head is in fact made of better marble than the body, but this has generally been excused on the grounds that it was probably a portrait added to a mass-produced body; as the head has been heavily restored, though, it is impossible to be sure whether an individual is intended. Discussing the whole statue, Bieber suggests that it could be meant to show a Roman empress in the guise of Health, since Livia and Domitia both associated themselves with Salus; e.g. a coin from Tiberius' principate has the bust of Livia with the inscription *Salus Augusta*.¹⁰⁴ In Sobel's 1990 monograph on Hygieia, however, the statue is illustrated without the head, which is no longer thought to belong to the body.¹⁰⁵

CONCLUSION

The image of Health as a young woman with a snake endures in the Classical tradition. A fine example can be seen in St. Bernard's Well, a tholos sheltering a statue of Hygieia beside the Water of Leith in Edinburgh, erected over a spring provided "for the benefit of the citizens of Edinburgh" by a nineteenth-century philanthropist (FIG. 44). In her right hand she holds a goblet, her left resting on a vase; a snake curls around beneath her left hand towards the spa-water pouring from the vase. As with all our representations from antiquity, Hygieia is only recognisable here by the context and by her attribute. Since no stories are attached to her, and she has virtually no existence apart from her place in Asklepios' cult, there is nothing to distract the viewer from her meaning, despite her human form. For a non-mythological figure Hygieia achieved astonishing success, which can only be due to the importance attached to the concept she embodies. The idea of deifying health is, after all, not an exclusively Greek one, as can be seen in the independent development

¹⁰³ Croissant 1990, no.40*.

¹⁰⁴ Bieber 1977, 47-9 fig.173; cf. Bieber 1915, 29-31 no.48.

¹⁰⁵ Sobel 1990, III.c.7 pl.10b.

of the Italic *Salus*, who is attested by archaic inscriptions from Horta, Pisaurum and Praeneste.¹⁰⁶

The importance of maintaining good health is demonstrated by the fact that while Asklepios was called on by the sick in their hour of need, he was also regularly worshipped by the healthy. Athens' two annual festivals in honour of Asklepios were celebrated by the whole city, and Epidauros' quadrennial Asklepieia, held nine days after the Isthmian Games, included athletic and dramatic contests.¹⁰⁷ If Asklepios himself embraces the preservation of health as well as the curing of sickness, his daughters may be understood as representing these aspects: Iaso, Akeso and Panakeia are the processes of healing, while Hygieia is a continuing state of good health. The "double-think" involved in recognising such an abstract character as Health as a goddess is mirrored by the remarkable nature of Asklepios' cult in general, with its combination of religious observance and practical medicine. That Hygieia only appears towards the end of the fifth century, and her image becomes widespread in the fourth, is not surprising; Hygieia, no less than Asklepios, could be called a "harbinger of the Hellenistic age".¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ See Axtell 1907/87, 13.

¹⁰⁷ On Asklepios as preserver of health, see Edelstein and Edelstein 1975, II 182-4.

¹⁰⁸ Parker 1996, 185.

Chapter 6

EIRENE: PROPAGANDA AND ALLEGORY¹

The decisive break-through of personifications into the realm of cult had taken place earlier, in the fourth century: increasingly, statues, altars, and even temples were erected for figures such as Eirene, Peace, and Homonoia, Concord; even Demokratia could not be forgotten. All this of course, is more propaganda than religion. The arbitrariness of the cult foundations could not be concealed; the profusion of robed female statues of an allegorical character arouses no more than dusty, aesthetic antiquarian interest.

Burkert 1985a, 186

If Hygieia developed as an aspect of Asklepios' divinity, as Peitho did from Aphrodite, her close association with the god goes some way to compensate for her lack of mythology, providing her with some sort of personality at least as a generic daughter. With the fourth century, however, we come to a class of cults frequently regarded as altogether lacking in religious seriousness: cults of personified political ideas, such as Burkert dismisses with his "more propaganda than religion". In this chapter I want to consider the figure of Eirene, the introduction of whose cult to fourth-century Athens is relatively well documented in ancient rhetoric and historiography. The inception of the cult is indeed given a political flavour by its association with a particular peace treaty, while the well known statue group by Kephisodotos of Peace holding the child Wealth, often assumed to be the cult image, presents an apparently straightforward allegorical message. We have already seen, however, that there are important precedents for cults of abstract ideas before the fourth century, and I should like now to counter Burkert's sweeping relegation of Eirene and her like to a status of "no more than dusty, aesthetic antiquarian interest".²

¹ An early version of this chapter was given as a paper at the Classical Association AGM at Nottingham, April 1996; of the audience there, Peter Rhodes and Ismene Lada-Richards made some particularly helpful suggestions.

² On the cult of Homonoia, see now Thériault 1996, who is equally concerned to argue against Burkert in favour of the religious character of such figures as Homonoia (184-8). The earliest attestation is an altar at Olympia established in 363 BC (Paus. 5.14.9). Parker draws attention to the "Decree on Concord" from Mytilene, which records public offerings to Homonoia and Dike probably in the 330s (SEG XXXVI 750.5-12; Parker 1996, 228 n.39). At Athens Homonoia does not appear in cult before the very end of the fourth century. *IG* II² 1261.19-20 mentions the dedication of a (statue of?) Demeter Homonoia (302/1 BC); *IG* II² 4985, inscribed on a round marble altar, begins 'Ομονοίας/ τοῦ θιάσου... (third century BC); *IG* II² 4795 records a priest of Homonoia (second century AD). On Homonoia's iconography, see Shapiro 1990. On fourth-century political personifications in Athenian art, see now Smith 1997, ch.4, wherein Eirene is discussed at some length (140-59).

THE ATHENIAN CULT OF PEACE

Our earliest evidence for the founding of the cult of Peace in Athens is from Isokrates' *Antidosis* of 354/3 BC, in the context of an *apologia* for his friend Timotheos. This paragon of an Athenian general, according to Isokrates, has not only captured many cities, but has done so without causing the city much financial outlay; after capturing Kerkyra against the odds,

he won a naval battle over the Lakedaimonians and forced them to conclude the peace, which has made such a great change to each of the cities that from that day we have sacrificed to her every year, because no other peace has been so advantageous to our city...³

Timotheos' campaign was conducted in 375 BC, his victory at Alyzia won on 12th Skirophorion (late May/early June), and peace concluded with the Spartans at some point between then and autumn 374.⁴ Nothing is known of its terms, but it was certainly shortlived, as hostilities resumed in autumn 373. Isokrates goes on to claim that Timotheos' victory reduced the Spartans to staying firmly within the Peloponnese, "and anyone can see in this fact the cause of their disaster at Leuktra". This is a slight overstatement, unless Isokrates is conflating Timotheos' peace with the more important "Peace of Kallias" of 371, which really did give Athens decisive command of sea, but can be excused as rhetorical licence.⁵ Isokrates' comment that "no other peace has been so advantageous to our city" suggests that the quality being celebrated is Athenian strength rather than any idea of "goodwill to all men", and a yearly state sacrifice commemorating the achievement certainly does sound like "a kind of war-memorial", though this need not diminish the status of the goddess involved.⁶ A

³ Isok. *Antid.* 109-110: καὶ περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον Λακεδαιμονίους ἐνίκησεν ναυμαχῶν, καὶ ταύτην ἠνάγκασεν αὐτοὺς συνθέσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην, ἥ τοσαύτην μεταβολὴν ἑκατέρᾳ τῶν πόλεων ἐποίησεν, ὥσθ' ἡμᾶς μὲν ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας θύειν αὐτῇ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ὡς οὐδεμιᾶς ἄλλης οὕτω τῇ πόλει συνενεγκούσης...

⁴ On the dating of the peace, see Cawkwell 1963, who argues for a date in 375, soon after Alyzia.

⁵ Nilsson 1952 cites the date 371 for Eirene's altar and instigation of sacrifices without comment. According to Pausanias (1.8.2), a statue of the elder Kallias, broker of the peace of c.449 with the Persians, stood in the vicinity of Kephisodotos' Eirene and Ploutos in the Agora. Simon would like to see the younger Kallias' influence on the group, pointing out that he was a priest at Eleusis, the one place where Ploutos seems to have had a role in cult (1988, 63-4). Sparkes suggests that Kephisodotos' statue was commissioned after the 371 peace (*CAH*² VI, pls.v-vi, no.33).

⁶ The "war-memorial" description is Parker's (1996, 230), a function which he also sees a number of "new cults" of the fifth century fulfilling (on which see 152-87).

fragment of the late fourth-century Philochoros puts a less glamorous, but entirely credible, gloss on the situation:

In the present context, too, Demosthenes could mention the next peace after the King's Peace, which the Athenians accepted gladly; Philochoros has argued the opposite case about this peace, that they accepted it much as they did that of Antalkidas the Lakonian, because they were tired of maintaining mercenary troops and worn down by war after such a long time, when they also established the altar of Peace.⁷

That Philochoros is indeed referring to the peace of 374 depends partly on his mention of the "altar of Peace" established at the same time, but ἐτέρας ἀπὸ βασιλέως εἰρήνης is most easily taken as "the next peace" chronologically, and we know of no other suitable candidates after 386 before 375/4.⁸ That the Athenians wanted peace in 375 because they were short of money is also made explicit in Xenophon's account; Isokrates is making a virtue out of a necessity when he praises Timotheos' thrift.⁹

Isokrates' positive version of events is elaborated upon by Cornelius Nepos, who includes a *Life of Timotheos* among his biographies of "illustrious men". Timotheos sailed around the Peloponnese and pillaged Lakonia, brought Kerkyra under Athenian control, gained allies, and defeated the Spartans, who "of their own accord conceded pre-eminence in maritime power to the Athenians" in the subsequent peace treaty:

That victory was such a delight for the people of Attika that then for the first time altars of Peace were made at public expense and a *pulvinar* established for this goddess.¹⁰

⁷ Philochoros, *FGrH* 328 F151 (ap. Didymos in *Demosth.* 10, 34 col. 7, 62): δύναιτο δ' ἂν καὶ ἐτέρας ἀπὸ βασιλέως εἰρήνης, ἣν ἀσμένως προσήκοντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, μνημονεύειν τὰ νῦν ὁ Δημοσθένης, περὶ ἧς πάλιν ὁ Φιλόχορος διείλεκται, ὅτι παραπλήσιον αὐτὴν τῇ τοῦ Λάκωνος Ἀνταλκίδου προσήκοντο, ἀπειρηκότες ταῖς ξενотροφίαις καὶ ἐκ πάνυ πολλοῦ τῷ πολέμῳ τετρυμένοι, ὅτε καὶ τὸν τῆς Εἰρήνης βωμὸν ἰδρύσαντο.

⁸ Wycherley (1957, no.154) translates "yet another peace originating with a king". This interpretation would certainly make sense in the light of Cawkwell's argument for the King of Persia's possible role in the peace of 375/4 (1963, 90); this is, however, speculative, Persian participation being "rendered certain" (n.54) only by the Philochoros fragment. If Wycherley's interpretation is correct, however, Philochoros' reference can *only* be dated by association with the altar of Peace, giving us a rather circular argument.

⁹ *Hell.* 6.2.1, cf. 5.4.64-6. Peter Rhodes points out that the Athenians "were conspicuously short of money" in the fighting which followed the break-down of the 375/4 peace (private communication 19/4/96).

¹⁰ Nepos *Timotheus* 2: *quo facto Lacedaemonii de diutina contentione destiterunt et sua sponte Atheniensibus imperii maritimi principatum concesserunt, pacemque iis legibus constituerunt, ut Athenienses mari duces essent. quae uictoria tantae fuit Atticis laetitiae, ut tum primum arae Paci publice sint factae eique deae pulvinar sit institutum. cuius laudis ut memoria maneret, Timotheo publice statuam in foro posuerunt.* Pausanias records statues of Timotheos and his father Konon in the Agora (1.3.1) and on the Akropolis (1.24.3), where fragments of a base for such a pair of statues have been found (*IG* II² 3774).

Again, the cult of Peace seems to be a kind of victory trophy, set up in the same spirit as the “statue of Timotheos in the agora, at public expense” which Nepos goes on to record. He is the only source to give us plural altars of Peace, which may not be significant, or might indicate that he was familiar with more than one in his own day.¹¹ Simon takes the *pulvinar* to indicate that Peace was honoured with *theoxenia* (the Roman *lectisternium*), a ritual banquet at which the deity was believed to be present, and for whom a couch (κλίνη, *pulvinar*) was made up as for the human participants.¹² Such banquets are more often associated with family rites, for heroes and the dead, but are attested in more public contexts at Athens for Zeus Philios and for the Dioskouroi at Athens, Sparta and Akragas.¹³ *Theoxenia* at Delphi were a major festival, after which a month was named, and involved delegations from all over Greece.¹⁴ If *theoxenia* generally had any connotations of gathering together potentially or actually hostile parties, human and divine, for a conciliatory communal feast they would seem appropriate for Peace. We have no other evidence to substantiate the theory that the Athenians worshipped Eirene in this way, however, and Nepos’ *pulvinar* could be meant in a more general sense, to indicate that the Peace was given the trappings of a real goddess of cult.¹⁵

The only source to cast any doubt on this account of the cult’s inception is Plutarch, who associates the altar of Peace with Kimon’s victory over the Persians at the Eurymedon in the mid-460s.¹⁶ Plutarch’s account, however, is obfuscated by his

¹¹ See below pp.221-2 for a similar problem with “altars of Pity”.

¹² Simon cites the Attic Deipnophoria for Kekrops’ daughters as a parallel (1986, 701).

¹³ Zeus Philios: CAF II 420 (= Athen. 239b). Dioskouroi: CAF I 5; hydria by the Kadmos Painter (ARV² 1187, 36); Pindar O. 3 with schol. (preface). *Theoxenia* are described in the mid-fifth-century *lex sacra* from the area sacred to Zeus Meilichios at Selinous (SEG XLIII 630A.14-16); see Jameson et al. 1993, 67-70.

¹⁴ Pindar *Paian* 6.60-5. Might Delphi have had a role in approving peace treaties? The first known instance of sending a treaty to a god for approval, however, is 356 BC, between Philip and the Chalcidians, which Parker suggests was an innovation of Philip’s for propagandistic purposes (1985, 309 and n.41; 309-10 on Delphi and inter-state relations generally). On the *theoxenia* in general, see Jameson 1994, who draws attention to their importance, and relates the practice to the iconography of the banqueting Herakles.

¹⁵ On *theoxenia* in general, see Jameson 1994, who draws attention to their importance, and relates the practice to the iconography of the banqueting Herakles. Pritchett (1979, 14-18) relates the question of what form the gods were present in at “divine banquets” to the similar problem with heroes accompanying armies to war. Note especially accounts of the Lokrians borrowing the Dioskouroi from the Spartans before the battle of the river Sagra, which involves the heroes’ transport by a ship equipped with a couch/cushions: ἔστρωσαν τοῖς Διοσκόροις κλίνην ἐπὶ τῆς νηός (Diod. 8.32), *pulvinaria iis in navi componunt* (Justin 20.3).

¹⁶ Plutarch *Kimon* 13.5: φασὶ δὲ καὶ βωμὸν Εἰρήνης διὰ ταῦτα τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἰδρύσασθαι, καὶ Καλλίαν τὸν πρεσβεύσαντα τιμῆσαι διαφερόντως.

apparent conflation of this event with the peace negotiated by Kallias with Persia in c.449/8; Kallias could conceivably have masterminded *two* peace treaties, but little is known of a post-Eurymedon peace, and no other sources link it with Kallias.¹⁷ It may not be entirely coincidental that Kimon's victory is also associated by at least one source with the dedication of an altar to PHEME, because news reached Athens the very same day.¹⁸ The date of Kephisodotos' Eirene and Ploutos is also of some relevance to the discussion, as it is often taken to be the cult statue.¹⁹ Its traditional assignment to 375/4 is to some extent dependent on our sources for the cult's inception, which are usually adduced in arguments against the possible down-dating to 360 suggested by some material evidence (see below). However, the sculpture is something of a red herring. While I would not question that it was generally associated with Eirene's cult, it cannot have been the cult statue in a strictly formal sense as there was no temple of Peace to house it. The exact relationship between the many statues and altars of the Agora is hard for us to reconstruct, and touches on the difficult question of the relationship between image and deity.²⁰ My basic point, however, is that since an altar is the only essential constituent for any cult, it would not be a problem if no statue had been present at the inauguration of the cult of Eirene. Practical considerations, such as finance and commissioning a sculptor of repute, might well delay the appearance of even a *bona fide* cult image; we might compare the case of Rhamnous, where the new temple of Nemesis of c.430 may pre-date Agorakritos' statue by several years.²¹ None of our sources gives us any indication of the location of Eirene's altar, though the agora, where Pausanias puts the statue group, is where one might expect the kind of cult indicated by Isokrates and Nepos to be.

Apart from Nepos' *pulvinar* we have a little evidence for the way in which Eirene was worshipped. A scholium on Aristophanes' *Peace* tells us:

They say that on the festival of the Synoikia a sacrifice is made to Peace, and that her altar is unbloodied, on the 16th of the month Hekatombaion. Some say that they sacrifice to her in this way for the obvious reason of freeing themselves from blood.²²

¹⁷ For an exhaustive discussion of Kallias' peace, see Badian (1987).

¹⁸ Schol. Aischin. 1.128-30. On PHEME, see Parker 1996, 233-4 and n.57.

¹⁹ E.g. "con l'inizio di un culto dell' Eirene nell' Agora di Atene, sembra difficile non postulare l'erezione di una statua votiva o di culto" (La Rocca 1974, 122).

²⁰ See above p.37.

²¹ See above p.106 and n.68 on Nemesis at Rhamnous.

²² Schol. Arist. *Peace* 1019-20: φασὶ γὰρ τῇ τῶν συνοικίων ἑορτῇ θυσίαν τελεῖσθαι Εἰρήνῃ, τὸν δὲ βωμὸν μὴ αἱματοῦσθαι, Ἑκατομβαιῶνος μηνὸς ἕκτη ἐπὶ δέκα. τινὲς δὲ φασιν ἐκ τῆς παρούσης αἰτίας οὕτως αὐτοὺς αὐτῇ θύειν αἵματος αὐτοὺς ἀπαλλάξάση.

The month of the sacrifice is confirmed by Eirene's appearance in the Dermatikon Accounts for Hekatombaion (below), although the date at which such a festival was first celebrated is debatable. It may be the subject of a fragmentary decree concerning the management of a major festival, with athletic, equestrian and musical competitions, which was to be set up by ...τὴν στήλην τὴν περὶ τῆς εἰρ[ήνης(?); from the letter forms the inscription has been dated to the early Lykourgan period, and it is quite conceivable that a new festival to Peace might have been established to celebrate the surprisingly lenient terms imposed by Philip after Chaironeia.²³ It would seem likely that a festival of some sort was introduced earlier, when the altar was established, but this would not preclude an expansion in the 330s. It has been suggested that the Synoikia might have been chosen for Eirene because it was the actual day on which the peace was made, or because the ancient festival was in need of revitalisation, and a celebration of the political union of Attika would be appropriate to the kind of commemoration of Athenian power suggested by Isokrates' account of the cult's inception.²⁴ It could also be significant that the date of 16th Hekatombaion makes Eirene's the first major festival of the Attic year, in early July, taking place a fortnight before the Panathenaia, just after the cereal harvest, making it a celebration of the safe gathering-in of the crops most vulnerable to the ravages of war.²⁵ That the goddess' altar is "unbloodied" is almost certainly conjecture on the scholiast's part, to account for the lines he is commenting on — *obviously* Peace is going to be opposed to bloodshed of any variety.²⁶ While bloodless sacrifice must have been common for private dedications, such an unspectacular offering as a plate of cakes would hardly do for the public rites of a goddess with such political potential.²⁷

²³ Schweigert 1938, 294-6 no.20, fig. 22; SEG XVI (1959) 55. See Robert (1977) for a discussion of the inscription, although his argument for an earlier date is rejected, with good reason, by Humphreys (1985, 224 n.16) and Parker (1996, 230).

²⁴ A Hekatombaion date for Timotheos' peace would accord with Cawkwell's arguments for its following closely after the victory at Alyzia. Cawkwell 1963, 89-90 and n.56; Parke 1977, 30-33; Parker 1996, 230. Synoikia: Thuc. 2.15.2, Plut. *Thes.* 24.4; Parker 1996, 14 and nn.16-17.

²⁵ On the distribution of festivals throughout the year, see Rosivach 1994, 54. On the interrelation between the agricultural and religious year in Attika, see Foxhall 1995; cf. Foxhall 1993 on the effects of warfare on agriculture.

²⁶ See below pp.198-201 on Aristophanes' *Peace*.

²⁷ See e.g. votive relief (Athens NM 1335) depicting worshippers loading an altar with bread and fruit for Hygieia and Asklepios (*infra* fig.40). On first fruit offerings in general, see Burkert 1985a, 66-8; on sacrificial cakes, see Kearns 1994. Bowie cites the rites of Black Demeter at Phigaleia (Paus. 8.42.11) for bloodless sacrifice to a "withdrawing" goddess: "Such 'bloodless' sacrifices were seen as characteristic of earlier, morally better eras before

That in fact Peace was annually in receipt of a very impressive, and indeed bloody, sacrifice of oxen is attested by the skin-sale records instituted by Lykourgos in the 330s.²⁸ These detail the income from the hides of victims sacrificed at a number of major festivals, honouring deities including Democracy, Agathe Tyche and Peace as well as the more familiar Athena, Zeus Soter and Dionysos. The skins “from the sacrifices to Peace by the generals” fetched 874 drachmas in 333/2 and 713 drachmas the following year.²⁹ Calculating just what that implies is fraught with variables, but taking Rosivach’s maximum estimate of 10 drachmas per hide would mean that at least 70-87 oxen were sacrificed to Peace. By the same estimate, the smallest sacrifice recorded in the accounts is 10 oxen to Agathe Tyche in 333/2, the largest 118 at the Theseia of 332/1, while Demokratia received 41 oxen in the same year. The sacrifice nearest to Eirene’s in scale is that of the City Dionysia, sales from the victims of 334/3 fetching 808 drachmas.³⁰ These figures may be approximate, but it is clear that the celebration of Peace was on a par with Athens’ most major festivals in the late 330s. However politically inspired the instigation and continued observance of the cult of Peace, the skin-sale records indicate that she was taken extremely seriously as a goddess in the late fourth century. Eirene does not entirely “disappear from our view” after the 330s,³¹ as an inscription of the mid-second century BC or later found near the monument of Lysikrates mentions that the official being honoured “has performed sacrifices to Eirene”.³²

slaughter of animals was needed to placate the gods” (1993, 144). In Aristophanes’ *Peace* the idea of an offering of “cooked vegetables” is rejected as only suitable for “a piffling little Hermes” (923-4).

²⁸ Discussed in detail by Rosivach 1994, 48-64, who argues that the festivals listed are the *epithetoi heortoi*. I am grateful to Robert Parker for first introducing me to this fascinating document, which he takes as his point of departure for a discussion of new cults in fourth century Athens (1996, 227-37), a draft of which he was kind enough to show me well in advance of publication. See Humphreys 1985 on Lykourgos, especially 210 and 212 on this inscription.

²⁹ *IG II²* 1496.93-5: ἐπὶ Νικοκράτους ἄρχοντος· ἐκ τῆς θυσίας τῇ Εἰρήνῃ/ παρὰ στρατηγῶν· 126-8: [ἐπὶ Νική]του ἄρχοντος· [ἐκ τῆς] θυσίας τῇ Εἰρήνῃ [παρὰ]/ [στρα]τηγῶν·

³⁰ Price of hides: Rosivach 1994, 62-4, 69 and 155-7. The figures for the Panathenaia are unfortunately not preserved. On Democracy, see Oliver 1960, 91 ff. On the cults of Demokratia and Agathe Tyche, see Parker 1996, 228-9 and 231-2. On the late third-century BC seat for the priest of Demokratia in the theatre of Dionysos, see Maaß 1972, 108-13.

³¹ Parker 1996, 230.

³² *IG II²* 1000.6-8: ὑπὲρ τῶν θυσιῶν ὧν ἔ[θυσεν τ... καὶ]/ τεῖ Εἰρήνῃ γεγονέναι [τὰ ἱερὰ καλὰ καὶ σω]-/τήρια. A reference to “Roman allies” precludes an earlier date.

KEPHISODOTOS' EIRENE AND PLOUTOS

Kephisodotos' representation of Peace must be among the "profusion of robed female statues of an allegorical character" which seem to arouse Burkert's antipathy (FIG. 45). The group's identity is established by Pausanias' description of the Athenian agora, where he mentions "Peace holding the child Wealth" near the monument of the Eponymous Heroes.³³ Pausanias gives us the name of the sculptor in an aside when talking about a similar group at Thebes, which apparently represented Fortune, rather than Peace, as the mother-figure, with the characteristic comment that both ideas were "clever".³⁴ Pliny puts Kephisodotos' *floruit* in the 102nd Olympiad (372-68 BC),³⁵ almost coinciding with the most widely accepted date for the founding of the Athenian cult of Peace and so supporting a date for the statue of 375/4, but as I have already argued, this need not have been erected immediately.³⁶ A later date has been argued from what appear to be representations of the group on six Panathenaic amphorai, found in Eretria in the late 1960s, which are inscribed with the archon-name Kallimedes, dating them to 360/59 BC (FIG. 46).³⁷ That the tiny mother and child groups depicted on either side of Athena's head represent a sculpture is clear from the pedestal on which they stand, and it is a reasonable assumption that they are a reference to a well known public monument. This does not necessarily date

³³ Pausanias 1.8.2: μετὰ δὲ τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἐπωνύμων ἐστὶν ἀγάλματα θεῶν, Ἀμφιάραος καὶ Εἰρήνη φέρουσα Πλοῦτον παῖδα. For discussion of the group, see Simon 1988, 62-6, Jung 1976, and La Rocca 1974; cf. Barber 1990 on its position in the agora. Pausanias also tells us of "statues of the goddesses Peace and Hestia" in (or near) the Prytaneion (1.18.3) somewhere between the precinct of Aglauros, on the north slope of the Akropolis, and the temple of Olympian Zeus. Peace would be a suitable companion for the public hearth, but we have no further information, and even the whereabouts of this Prytaneion are uncertain; cf. Stewart 1997, 152 for the appropriateness of the association.

³⁴ Paus. 9.16.1-2: Θηβαίοις δὲ μετὰ τοῦ Ἀμμωνος τὸ ἱερὸν οἶωνοσκοπεῖόν τε Τειρεσίου καλούμενον καὶ πλησίον Τύχης ἐστὶν ἱερὸν· φέρει μὲν δὴ Πλοῦτον παῖδα· ὥς δὲ Θηβαῖοι λέγουσι, χεῖρας μὲν τοῦ ἀγάλματος καὶ πρόσωπον Ξενοφῶν εἰργάσατο Ἀθηναῖος, Καλλιστόνικος δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιχώριος. σοφὸν μὲν δὴ καὶ τούτοις τὸ βούλευμα, ἐσθεῖναι Πλοῦτον ἐς τὰς χεῖρας ἅτε μητρὶ ἢ τροφῇ τῇ Τύχῃ, σοφὸν δὲ οὐχ ἦσσαν τὸ Κηφισοδότου· καὶ γὰρ οὗτος τῆς Εἰρήνης τὸ ἄγαλμα Ἀθηναίοις Πλοῦτον ἔχουσιν πεποίηκεν. Xenophon the Athenian sculptor is known to have worked in first half of the fourth century, which would place the Theban group near the Athenian chronologically as well as thematically. Hadzisteliou Price describes the Theban group as "due to late Classical and Hellenistic taste for personifications", citing an extant fourth-century Ionian statuette as comparison (1978, 62-3, fig. 38).

³⁵ Pliny *N.H.* 34.50; Plutarch tells us that Kephisodotos' sister was first wife of the Athenian general Phokion, who was born c.402 BC: τῶν δὲ γυναικῶν ἃς ἔγημε περὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐθὲν ἱστορεῖται, πλὴν ὅτι Κηφισόδοτος ἦν ὁ πλάστης ἀδελφὸς αὐτῆς (*Phokion* 19).

³⁶ Even earlier dates (403 or 393 BC) have been proposed for the group, but these are unlikely on stylistic grounds (La Rocca 1974, 122).

³⁷ For Kallimedes' archonship, see La Rocca 1974, 125 n.40.

Kephisodotos' group to 360/59, of course, but that it was a recent addition to Athenian public space is the most obvious explanation for its depiction on such vases; in this case it could have been connected with the Common Peace of 362/1, although we have no sources to establish such an association.³⁸ Arguments over the group's exact date are likely to remain inconclusive, but our cult sources and the amphorai give us *termini post* and *ante quem*.³⁹ The vase-paintings indicate that Eirene's right arm held a staff and the child held a cornucopia in his left arm, both of which items are missing in the Munich copy (FIG. 45), the most complete of several Roman copies still extant.⁴⁰ In addition to these, and Pausanias' testimony, the group's appearance on a Hadrianic coin suggests that it was still a familiar feature in Athens in the second century AD (FIG. 47).

None of our sources for the cult of Peace makes any mention of the child held by Kephisodotos' Eirene, and were it not for Pausanias, we would not know whom either figure was meant to represent. Like most of the personifications considered so far, the female figure is quite without attributes, apart from the staff, a symbol of authority suitable for any goddess (recalling Themis). The fact that she is holding a child could make her any one of a number of *kourotrophoi* known from literature, Gaia being perhaps the most likely candidate for Athens.⁴¹ The child's cornucopia is more helpful, with its connotations of plenty, though other extant representations of Wealth holding a cornucopia are all mid-fourth century or later, so possibly derivative of Kephisodotos' group.⁴² Even once the child is identified, however, mythological

³⁸ The cock columns flanking Athena on Panathenaic vases of the sixth and fifth centuries give way in the fourth to statue groups, which seem to be associated with the eponymous archon, as they change from year to year; the columns may be indications of an actual outdoor sanctuary and statue of "Panathenaic Athena": Neils 1992, 33-4, 36-7 (cf. above pp.165-6). On Athenian relations with and attitudes towards Sparta at this period, see Fisher 1994.

³⁹ La Rocca (1974, 128-30) defends the 375/4 date with a stylistic analysis, adducing the personified Kerkyra on a decree-relief of 375/4 (Athens NM 1467) as a parallel and contrasting the figure of Peloponnesos on a relief of 362/1 (Athens NM 1481). Simon commits herself only to somewhere within the range 374-360 (1986, 703 no. 8).

⁴⁰ On the other copies, see La Rocca 1974, with figs. 1-3 and 7-17; apart from the Munich one, he catalogues 6 torsos and 4 heads of Eirene, and 2 Ploutoi.

⁴¹ On earlier identifications of the group, primarily as Leukothea and Bakchos, or Ge Kourotrophos, see Hadzisteliou Price 1978, 62 and Shapiro 1986, 8. On Gaia at Athens, see above p.86 n.98.

⁴² See below, n.48. For an extensive study of the Classical and Hellenistic cornucopia, see Bemmann 1994. A securely identifiable young Ploutos (inscription: ΠΛΟΤΟΣ) does appear *without* a cornucopia on a chous of c.400 BC: Berlin F 2661, ARV² 1321, 3; Clinton 1994a 17*; Stafford 1998, pl.12.

tradition makes Ploutos the son of Demeter, not Eirene, and references to him as a deity are almost exclusively connected with the Eleusinian Mysteries. In Hesiod he is son of Demeter and Iasion, and “makes rich whoever meets him”, a role he plays at the end of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, where he is a gift from the goddesses to their initiates, “giving riches to mortal men”.⁴³ He is amongst the otherwise unexceptional list of Demeter’s associates in the call to prayer in Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazousai* of 411 BC, though the idea that Wealth should be a god seems to be ridiculed in Euripides’ *Cyclops* just a few years later.⁴⁴ The Wealth of Aristophanes’ play of 388 BC seems unconvincing as a deity, despite the attempts of Chremylos to flatter him as “greatest of all *daimones*”; unlike the Ploutos of myth he is portrayed as an old man, his blindness stemming from Hipponax’s description.⁴⁵ More usually Ploutos is depicted as a child, and a number of vases show him in the company of Demeter/Persephone. This association with the Mysteries can perhaps be explained by an interesting etymology in Plato’s *Kratylos* for the king of the Underworld’s names:

He was also called Plouton, this being because he gives wealth (*ploutos*), since wealth comes up from the earth beneath; as for “Hades”, I think people in general suppose that the invisible (*a-eides*) is indicated by this word, and because they fear the name call him “Plouton”.⁴⁶

That Pluto was often associated with the idea of wealth is shown by a number of vase-paintings in which the enthroned king of the Underworld is shown holding a cornucopia.⁴⁷ Ploutos himself, however, is only represented as a child, varying in age

⁴³ The place of birth in Hesiod is “the thrice-ploughed field, in rich Crete”, suggestive of his character as agricultural wealth (*Theog.* 969-74). *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 486-9; cf. Attic skolion *PMG* 885: Πλούτου μητέρ’ Ὀλυμπίαν αἰδῶ/ Δῆμητρα στεφανηφόροις ἐν ὥραις... See Clinton (1992b, 53-5) on “the Ploutos of Demeter” as the object of initiands’ desires, and (91-4) on Ploutos as the “divine” child whose birth was proclaimed during the initiation ritual (Hippolytos, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, 5.8.40). On the hymn and Eleusis, see Parker 1991.

⁴⁴ Aristoph. *Thes.* 295-300; Clinton suggests the name should be emended to Plouton (1992a, 54 n.131). On Eur. *Cyclops* 316-7, see above pp.30-1.

⁴⁵ Aristoph. *Plout.* 230. MacDowell (1996, 329-31) describes Wealth as “one of the most complex allegories in any of Aristophanes’ plays”, and points out the ambiguity of his status as god/man/abstract, especially noticeable in his speech at 234-44.

⁴⁶ Plato *Kratylos* 403a: τὸ δὲ Πλούτωνος, τοῦτο μὲν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πλούτου δόσιν, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς γῆς κάτωθεν ἀνίεται ὁ πλοῦτος, ἐπωνομάσθη· ὁ δὲ “Ἀιδης,” οἱ πολλοὶ μὲν μοι δοκοῦσιν ὑπολαμβάνειν τὸ αἰδὲς προσειρῆσθαι τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ, καὶ φοβούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα “Πλούτωνα” καλοῦσιν αὐτόν.

⁴⁷ See Schauenburg 1953, fig.1 for the king of Underworld enthroned, attended by Hermes and satyrs, holding a cornucopia (Heidelberg skyphos, inv. E49; 370-60 BC). Schauenburg adduces 23 parallels for Pluto with cornucopia, e.g. ARV 438, 22 (Paris amphora) and ARV 398, 57 (Athens pelike), figs. 4 and 5. On Lykourgos’ refurbishing of the cult of Pluto at Eleusis, and Pluto as “giver of agricultural wealth”, see Mitchell 1970, 45 and nn.183-6.

from infancy to early adolescence, but always naked, often holding a cornucopia.⁴⁸ The only other appearance of Wealth in a ritual context is less obviously anthropomorphic, in Plutarch's description of "the driving out of ox-hunger" at Chaironeia, a ceremony which he relates as being practised in his own time:

There is a traditional sacrifice, which the archon performs at the public hearth but everyone else at home; it is called "the driving out of ox-hunger". Striking one of the servants with wands of *agnus castus* they drive him out of doors, chanting "Out with Ox-hunger, in with Wealth and Health".⁴⁹

Though rather removed from any of our other references, this does show Ploutos as the antithesis of famine, maintaining the association with Demeter and agrarian plenty.

For a fourth-century viewer the problem of identifying Kephisodotos' figures was presumably obviated by the group's fame, and there may well have been an identifying inscription on its base. But given the lack of mythological precedent, the question remains, why should Kephisodotos have thought of representing Peace holding the child Wealth? Parke comments that the group "by rather obvious allegory indicated that the wars of Athens had led to her impoverishment", but Parke, even more than Pausanias, has the benefit of a long tradition of allegorical representation to inform his viewing.⁵⁰ Kephisodotos' Peace and Wealth is not quite without precedent in general terms, it is true. Shapiro has convincingly exploded the myth that allegory was invented by Apelles, collecting ample examples to refute Reinhardt's assertion that Archaic and Classical art "kennt Allegorisches noch nicht".⁵¹ In particular, he can

Pluto is a more likely candidate for the column figure on two early fourth-century Panathenaic amphorai which Neils identifies as Wealth — a mature bearded man, draped from the waist down, holding a sceptre in his right hand, a large cornucopia in his left: Neils 1992, 33-4, fig. 25, cat. no. 25 (attributed to the Asteios Group) and Berlin 3980 (with archon-name Philokles, 392/1 BC); see Clinton 1992, 105-6.

⁴⁸ For discussion of the Eleusinian Ploutos' iconography and significance, see Clinton 1992, 49-55, where he proposes identifying the youth in the great Eleusinian relief as Ploutos, handing a bunch of wheat stalks to Demeter (Athens NM 126, c.430 BC); see 91-4 on Ploutos' possible role in the ritual drama of the Mysteries. See also Clinton 1994a for representations of Ploutos in vase-painting, and on ancient and modern confusion with Pluto; he concludes that "P. was a mere personification and never given formal worship as a god; no sacrifices are attested" (416). Hamdorf (1964, 49) sees Ploutos in a more generous light as the "göttliche Kind" par excellence, entrusted to the Eleusinian goddesses.

⁴⁹ Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 6.8 (*Moralia* 693e-f): Θυσία τις ἔστι πάτριος, ἣν ὁ μὲν ἄρχων ἐπὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἐστίας δρᾷ τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἕκαστος ἐπ' οἴκου· καλεῖται δὲ 'βουλίου ἐξέλασις'. καὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν ἓνα τύπτοντες ἀγνίναϊς ῥάβδοις διὰ θυρῶν ἐξελαύνουσιν, ἐπιλέγοντες 'ἔξω Βούλιμον ἔσω δὲ Πλοῦτον καὶ Ὑγίειαν.' Cf. West 1966, 331 (*ad* 593) on Poverty and Plenty. On the ritual, see MacDowell 1995, 270-1 nn.17-8; on "scapegoat rituals" in general, see Burkert 1985a, 82-4.

⁵⁰ Parke 1977, 33.

⁵¹ Shapiro 1986; Reinhardt 1960, 34.

adduce a number of two-figure allegories, the simplest form possible, of the Archaic period — in literature, Homer’s Ate and the Litai; in the visual arts, the struggle of Dike and Adikia on the Chest of Kypselos and on two late sixth-century Attic vases. This “combining (of) two personifications into a meaningful relationship” is perhaps most familiar from the genealogical linkings made by Hesiod and the archaic lyric poets, where the message lies not in any narrative content, as in the case of Justice overcoming Injustice, but in the relationship between the figures.⁵² Kephisodotos’ group, however, remains the earliest example of such an allegory in extant monumental art, and its directness must have been quite striking to an audience as yet unjaundiced by such a “profusion” of figures as Burkert somewhat anachronistically has in mind.

THE TRADITION OF PEACE AND PROSPERITY

Though iconographically innovative, Kephisodotos’ group is an overt formulation of a proposition with some pedigree. The concepts which Eirene and Ploutos personify are linked as early as Homer, “wealth and peace in plenty” being decreed by Zeus in his settling of the feud at the end of the *Odyssey*.⁵³ Hesiod makes the link between political and agricultural well-being in his genealogy of the Seasons, who are called Lawfulness, Justice and Peace, daughters of Themis; the implications of Peace are neatly encapsulated in the adjective τεθαλυῖαν, “luxuriant”, attached to her, while Pindar’s version explicitly makes this family “guardians of wealth for men”.⁵⁴ The same association with both Justice and prosperity seems to be made in the *Hymn of the Kouretes*:

... were fruitful year by year, and Justice possessed mankind... which prosperity-loving Peace...⁵⁵

Following the Harrison-Nilsson line that the hymn is “Uralt” in origin and its addressee, Zeus Diktaios, is the Cretan “Vegetationsgott”, Simon argues that Eirene is popular as a fertility deity from the Minoan period, and Kephisodotos’ representation

⁵² On two-figure allegory see Shapiro 1986, 6-8.

⁵³ Homer *Od.* 24.485-6.

⁵⁴ Hes. *Theog.* 901-3; Pind. *O.* 13.6-8 (464 BC); see above pp.68-8 on Themis.

⁵⁵ *Hymn of the Kouretes* 37-40: [..... β]ρύον κατῆτος,/ καὶ βροτὸς Δίκα κατῆχε,/ [.....]ιπ’ ἐξώ/ ἅ φίλολβος Εἰρήνα. ᾠραι δὲ has been suggested for l.37, whence presumably Simon’s assertion that the hymn names Eirene as one of the Seasons (1986, 705). See West 1965 on the text.

of her as *kourotrophos* draws upon a “jahrtausendalte religiöse Tradition”.⁵⁶ Quite apart from its dependence on the unfashionable fertility paradigm, however, Simon’s argument is undermined by the fact that, even in Nilsson’s opinion, the extant form of the hymn is Hellenistic, so there is no reason why the passage in question should not be derived from the Hesiodic genealogy.⁵⁷ For Eirene’s “early popularity” and association with fertility Simon also cites a fragment of a Samian folksong:

Open yourselves up, doors! Great Wealth is coming in, and with Wealth luxuriant
Euphrosyne and good Peace.⁵⁸

This is preserved in a life of Homer, who is supposed to have gone around the households of Samos singing songs called Εἰρεσιώναι to bring prosperity. Simon makes a connection between the Samian songs and the *eiresionai* of the Athenian Thargelia and Pyanepsia festivals. These *eiresionai* were apparently branches of olive or laurel bound with wool, much like the suppliant’s bough, which were carried by a group of boys who went from house to house singing and collecting gifts in return for bringing this symbol of fruitfulness; the branches were later fastened above the door for continued prosperity.⁵⁹ The ritual itself may be early, but as with the Cretan hymn, the antiquity of the Samian song is open to question, and the link between a Samian Eirene and Athens is not strong; the words of the Athenian Eiresione reported by Plutarch make no mention of Eirene, Ploutos or any other deity.⁶⁰

A passage commonly cited as the earliest literary reference to Peace as mother of Wealth is a fragment of Bakchylides, part of a Paian for Apollo Pythaeus at Asine:

Peace gives birth for mortals to haughty W/wealth, and the flowers of honey-tongued songs, the burning of the thighs of oxen and fleecy sheep in yellow flame on carved altars for gods, and young men’s concern with the gymnasium, with pipes and revelry...⁶¹

⁵⁶ Simon 1986, 705, and 1988, 57-8.

⁵⁷ Nilsson 1968, 546. Bremer opts for composition in the fourth century BC, though the hymn “might well be the product of a religious mentality which is much older and belongs to the second millennium BC” (1981, 295). On the development of the fertility paradigm and its application to Greek religion, see Lowe 1983, esp. 1-119; see also Lowe 1998 on the case of the Thesmophoria and the ninth-century scholion on Lucian’s *Hetairikoi Dialogoi*, the one “ancient” text that seems to support the Frazerian fertility model explicitly.

⁵⁸ *Carmina Popularia* fr.1 Diehl 3-5: αὐταὶ ἀνακλίνεσθε, θύραι· Πλούτος γὰρ ἔσεισι/ πολλός, σὺν Πλούτῳ δὲ καὶ Εὐφροσύνη τεθαλυῖα/ Εἰρήνη τ’ ἀγαθή (ap. Herod. *Vita Homer.* 33).

⁵⁹ Simon 1988, 57-9. On the Athenian *Eiresione* see Simon 1983, 76-7 (s.v. Thargelia and Pyanepsia), (pl.3.1); Parke 1977, 76. On the suppliant’s bough see below pp.218-19.

⁶⁰ Plut. *Thes.* 22.7.

⁶¹ Bakchylides fr.4 Maehler 61-8: τίκτει δέ τε θνατοῖσιν εἰ-/ρήνα μεγαλάνορα πλούτον/ καὶ μελιγλώσσων ἀοιδᾶν ἄνθεα/ δαίδαλέων τ’ ἐπὶ βωμῶν/ θεοῖσιν αἶθεσθαι βοῶν ξανθᾶι φλογί/ μηρί’ εὐμάλῃων τε μήλων/ γυμνασίων τε νέοις/ αὐλῶν τε καὶ κώμων μέλειν. Cf. Campbell

This could almost be a parody of a Hesiodic genealogy: the list of Eirene's "children" begins straightforwardly enough with a noun (πλοῦτος) qualified by a "personifying" adjective (μεγαλάνωρ), but in apposition to this are the elaborately designated Songs, and whole clauses to describe Sacrifices and the pleasant Pastimes of youth. An English translation is hampered by the initial-capital convention, which makes too sharp a distinction between the first and subsequent offspring of Peace. The autoschediastic nature of this genealogy is demonstrated by its absence from Eirene's environs for the rest of the fifth century: while the concepts continue to be associated, Peace is not mother of Wealth again until Kephisodotos unites the two in bronze.⁶²

EURIPIDES' AND ARISTOPHANES' PEACE

Independently of Ploutos, Eirene makes a number of appearances as a goddess in the plays of Euripides and Aristophanes and in contemporary visual arts. Although she did not receive public worship until 375/4, there is every reason to suppose that in the last quarter of the fifth century she was increasingly seen as a real power, a power whose desirability was thrown into focus by the Peloponnesian War.⁶³

A fragment of Euripides' *Kresphontes*, preserved in Stobaios' section "On Peace", is a choral ode addressed to Eirene:

Peace, with your depths of wealth and fairest of the blessed gods, I am eager for you as you delay; I fear old age may overwhelm me with hardships before I look upon your graceful prime, your fine-dancing songs, your garland-loving revels. Come, lady, to my city; shut out from our homes hateful Sedition and the raging Strife who delights in sharpened iron.⁶⁴

The context of most of the play's fragments is uncertain, but this is the beginning of one of the main stasima, and presumably precedes the appearance of the young

Greek Lyric V (Anon. frs.), 1021: ὦ γλυκεῖ' Εἰράνα,/ πλουτοδότειρα βροτοῖς (Bergk suggested Pindaric authorship).

⁶² An alternative genealogy for Peace is preserved in a fragment of Aristotle, quoted by Plutarch: "In ancient times they used to call Kalauria Eirene after a woman Eirene, who, the story goes, was born of Poseidon and Melantheia, daughter of Alpheios" (Aristotle fr.597 Rose = Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 19). Hopwood (1986, 199) suggests that this claim was meant to promote the peace-keeping role of the Kalaurian Amphictyony.

⁶³ For an overview of war and peace in Euripides and Aristophanes, see Spiegel 1990, 99-125.

⁶⁴ Euripides fr.453 Nauck (= 71 Austin): Εἰρήνην βαθύπλουτε καὶ/ καλλίστα μακάρων θεῶν,/ ζῆλός μοι σέθεν ὥς χρονίζεις./ δέδοικα δὲ μὴ πόνοις/ ὑπερβάλῃ με γῆρας,/ πρὶν σὰν προσιδεῖν χαρίεσσιν ὥραν/ καὶ καλλιχόρους ἀοιδὰς/ φιλοστεφάνους τε κόμους./ ἴθι μοι, πότνια, πόλιν./ τὰν δ' ἐχθρὰν Στάσιν εἶργ' ἀπ' οἷ-/κων τὰν μαινομένην τ' Ἔριν/ θηκτῶι τερπομένην σιδάρωι.

Kresphontes. The chorus are voicing resentment at the internal discord which has facilitated Polyphontes' murder of the elder Kresphontes, which his son will avenge on his return from exile, thereby regaining the throne. The Peace being invoked is characterised by her opposition to two other personifications, Stasis and Eris.⁶⁵ Eris is of course well known from epic and vase painting, and appears again in the context of civil strife in the *Phoenician Women* (411-09 BC).⁶⁶ Stasis is a more shadowy figure, only lightly personified here, as she is in Pindar's "angry Sedition, giver of poverty, a hostile nurse of young men".⁶⁷ The *Kresphontes*' date is probably in the mid-420s, and certainly before Aristophanes' *Georgoi* (425-1 BC) in which the invocation of Peace is parodied; Timaios' report that Hermokrates quoted the first eight lines of the hymn at the Sicilian peace conference of summer 424 BC is probably not reliable.⁶⁸ Collard points out that the fragment uses the Aeolic metre and the form of words standard to an invocatory hymn, and it fits with Bremer's categorisation of invocation (including name and epithets/attributes), argument and petition.⁶⁹ It is in fact a formulaic element which is the butt of Aristophanes' parody, the compound adjective βαθύπλουτος: "Peace, with your depths of wealth, and little team of oxen...".⁷⁰ Use of the hymn form does not of course necessarily imply cult, but, at least in the tragic context, it does indicate that Peace can be taken seriously as a goddess.⁷¹

Peace is again opposed to civil strife in Euripides' *Supplikes*, which may also date from 424 BC.⁷² Kreon's herald is trying to dissuade Theseus from embarking on

⁶⁵ That Stasis and Eris should be "shut out of our homes" calls to mind the "driving out of Ox-hunger" ritual (above).

⁶⁶ *Phoin.* 798: ἡ δεινά τις Ἔρις θεός. On Eris see Shapiro 1993, 51-61.

⁶⁷ Pindar fr.109.3-4 SM: στάσιν ἀπὸ πραπίδος ἐπικότον ἀνελῶν,/ πενίας δότειραν, ἐχθρὰν κουροτρόφον. Pindar's Stasis is opposed to Hesychia rather than Eirene, but he seems to use *hesychia* in much the same sense, e.g. O. 4.16 (Psaumis "turns his steps with pure purpose to city-loving Quiet"), N. 9.48 ("Quiet loves the drinking party"); see above p.31 for P. 8.1-7. For Stasis see also Dio Chrysostom's attendants of Tyrannis: Ὁμότης καὶ Ὑβρις καὶ Ἀνομία καὶ Στάσις (1.82). Euripides' Stasis is not capitalised by Austin (ed. 1968).

⁶⁸ Timaios *FGrH* 566 F22. This is cited by Polybios (12.25k.1-26.9) as an example of Timaios' shortcomings as a historian, in particular that he puts improbable speeches into the mouths of his characters; in Polybios' opinion the great statesman Hermokrates is most unlikely to have made such a poor argument, or to have adduced Homer and Euripides in support of the commonplace that peace is better than war. On the *Kresphontes* see Collard, Cropp and Lee (1995, 121-47).

⁶⁹ On hymn structure, see Bremer 1989, 193-7.

⁷⁰ Ar. *Georgoi* fr.111: Εἰρήνη βαθύπλουτε καὶ ζευγάριον βοεικόν...

⁷¹ On hymns in drama, see Bremer 1989, 212-13, and Furley 1995, 37-9.

⁷² Zuntz (1955, 88-93) argues that the play fits Athens' situation in 424, the same year as the *Knights*, with its "atmosphere of public buoyancy" (90).

a war against Thebes, arguing that people would be wise to think of the consequences before they vote for war:

Yet of the two propositions we know, all of us, the good and the bad, and which is better, by how much better for mortals is peace than war; she is best and dearest friend of the Muses, but enemy to Vengeance, she delights in fair children, and joys in wealth.⁷³

The praise of Peace in opposition to Ποινάι is rather ironic in the circumstances, since Thebes is herself exacting retribution by refusing to allow Adrastus and the Argive widows to bury their dead, and thereby breaking one of the first rules of any post-victory peace treaty.⁷⁴ Eirene is much more of a rhetorical device here than the Peace of the *Kresphontes*, being explicitly a λόγος in the first half of the sentence, though her association with fertility and wealth is clear. In the later *Orestes* (408 BC) Eirene is unequivocally a θεά, albeit briefly. When Apollo intervenes to sort out the chaos in Argos, he ends with an injunction to everyone to “Go on your way now, honouring the fairest of goddesses, Peace”.⁷⁵ The scholiast comments: “He says this because at that time the Peloponnesian War was going on in Greece; the Athenians had not been persuaded by the Lakedaimonian embassies to make peace.”⁷⁶ The reference is to the rejection of a Spartan peace offer two years earlier by Kleophon, to whom the scholiast sees an allusion in the “villainous leaders” of l.772. Whether such a specific allusion was meant or would have been understood by Euripides’ audience is debatable, but the general point could hardly have been missed.⁷⁷

If Euripides’ hymn suggests that Eirene is recognised as a deity in the mid-420s, Aristophanes’ *Peace* confronts the question of her status head-on a few years later, the action centring on Trygaeus’ recovery of Peace and establishment of her cult in an ideal Athens. The play must have been written during the negotiations which would lead to the Peace of Nikias, which took effect from the 25th Elaphebolion 421 BC, about a fortnight after the play’s production at the City Dionysia. The very fact

⁷³ Eur. *Supp.* 486-91: καίτοι δυοῖν γε πάντες ἄνθρωποι λόγοιν/ τὸν κρείσσον' ἴσμεν, καὶ τὰ χρηστὰ καὶ κακά,/ ὅσῳ τε πολέμου κρείσσον εἰρήνη βροτοῖς./ ἡ πρῶτα μὲν Μοῦσαισι προσφιλεστάτη,/ Ποινάϊσι δ' ἐχθρά, τέρεται δ' εὐπαιδία,/ χαίρει δὲ πλούτῳ.

⁷⁴ See Paus. 1.43.7 on the personification of Ποινή. On Adrastus, see below pp.210-11.

⁷⁵ Eur. *Or.* 1682-3 (408 BC): ἴτε νυν καθ' ὁδόν, τὴν καλλίστην/ θεῶν Εἰρήνην τιμῶντες.

⁷⁶ Schol. Eur. *Or.* 1682-3: θεὸν Εἰρήνην τιμῶντες: τοῦτό φησι διὰ τὸ κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν ἐνεστηκέναι τὰ Πελοποννησιακά· πρεσβευομένοις γὰρ Λακεδαιμονίοις περὶ εἰρήνης οὐκ ἐπείσθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι. Cf. ad 772.

⁷⁷ Wycherley (1957, no.155): “This emphasis on the importance of the goddess may, however, have no reference to her cult at Athens but merely reflect the longing for peace.”

that Trygaios has to found a cult for Peace indicates that a public cult was not yet observed, but the play does present us with a very real goddess.⁷⁸ When Trygaios arrives in heaven, he learns that War has thrown Peace into a “deep cave”, εἰς τοῦτ' τὸ κάτω (223-4), from where she is hauled up in the following scene. Bowie compares the raising of Peace to the *anodoi* of various gods in myth and ritual, especially Persephone, and draws parallels with the Athenian Anthesteria, a festival celebrating “the return of the god (Dionysos) at springtime after an absence in an enclosed place”.⁷⁹ Once Peace has been raised, Trygaios “performs the installation of the goddess” (923) in a scene which clearly reflects the standard procedure for such a ceremony. After some discussion of what constitutes a suitable sacrificial offering for Peace, a sheep is decided upon (923-37) and Trygaios goes to fetch an altar, though a few lines later he seems to spot the altar to Dionysos already to hand in the middle of the *orchestra*, a reminder of the religious context of the original performance.⁸⁰ The slave’s refusal to slaughter the sheep on the grounds that it is οὐ θέμις (1018), for “surely Peace does not delight in slaughter, nor is her altar bloodied”, is almost certainly a joke.⁸¹ Trygaios solves the problem by sending the slave to do the actual killing indoors while he himself prepares the fire for roasting. This is the only serious irregularity in an otherwise familiar ritual of sacrifice, preceded by the purification of all in attendance, the scattering of barley, and a prayer to the goddess: “O most revered divine queen, lady Peace, mistress of dances, mistress of weddings, accept our sacrifice...”⁸²

⁷⁸ MacDowell 1995, 193: “Of course the performance of such a ritual in comedy was not equivalent to the inauguration of a new cult in real life, but Aristophanes may be implying that such a cult is desirable, foreshadowing its actual establishment forty-seven years later.” On the relation between the play and the Peace of Nikias (ibid. 197): “the point must be that Trygaios accomplishes what has not been accomplished in real life”. Bowie adduces the precedent of various personifications in literature and a few in Attic cult: “Aristophanes’ representation of a cult of Peace would have been somewhat novel, therefore, but it did not start a fashion” (1993, 142, n.51).

⁷⁹ Bowie 1993, 142-50. On the deaths of Kleon and Brasidas he comments “The descent to Hades of these two warmongers will balance the return of Peace from the ground” (137, n.17). See Bérard 1974 for the iconography of Persephone’s ascent from the Underworld. Thanks to Ismene Lada-Richards for drawing this aspect of the play to my attention.

⁸⁰ Aristoph. *Peace* 942: ὦς ταῦτα δηλὰ γ' ἔσθ'· ὁ γὰρ βωμὸς θύρασι καὶ δῆ.

⁸¹ Aristoph. *Peace* 1019-20: οὐχ ἤδεταί δῃ πουθεν Εἰρήνη σφαγαῖς, / οὐδ' αἵματοῦται βωμός. Sommerstein 1985, 181: “he is *conjecturing* that Peace is the sort of goddess who will find bloodshed of any kind abhorrent”. See above pp.187-8.

⁸² Aristoph. *Peace* 974-7: ὦ σεμνοτάτῃ βασιλείᾳ θεά, / πότνι' Εἰρήνη, / δέσποινα χορῶν, / δέσποινα γάμων, / δέξαι θυσίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν.

Peace herself is a statue, dragged into view at 1.519, and apparently remaining on stage thereafter. The only indication we have of her appearance is the chorus-leader's comment that she is εὐπρόσωπος because of her connection with Pheidias (615-18). This is occasioned by Hermes' explanation of how Peace came to be driven out in the first place: Perikles provoked war to divert attention from the scandal surrounding his friend Pheidias, accused of misappropriating materials provided for the chryselephantine statue of Athena Parthenos and including himself and Perikles among the figures on Athena's shield (603-14).⁸³ Aristophanes' statue of Peace was apparently on a grand scale, as indicated by reports that the play was parodied by Eupolis, in his *Autolykos*, and Plato, in his *Victories*: "It is even made a matter for comedy that he raised up the colossal statue of Peace."⁸⁴ We know of no visual representations of Eirene earlier than 421, so Aristophanes' stage-prop may have been the first; presumably she looked like any other personification of the period, a beautiful young woman of marriageable age.⁸⁵

The *dramatis personae* include a number of other personifications, who all take a more active part in the proceedings than the statue. War (Polemos) and his attendant Uproar (Kydoimos) have speaking parts, and Theoria and Opora, though silent, are treated as objects of very human sexual interest, attentions which Peace herself is spared, as befits her divine status.⁸⁶ The fact that Theoria and Opora are Eirene's attendants is very much equivalent to the kind of allegory represented by Kephisodotos' group. The characters' names are variously rendered, reflecting the difficulty of finding an exact equivalent for the terms,⁸⁷ but MacDowell's "Festival-going" and "Vintage" are apt.⁸⁸ Opora is properly "late summer", the time of the grape harvest, which makes her literally one of the Seasons, a position usurped by

⁸³ On the truth or otherwise of the accusation see MacDowell 1995, 186-9.

⁸⁴ Eupolis fr.62 (PCG V) = Plato fr.86 (PCG VII): κωμωιδεῖται δὲ καὶ <ὅτι> τὸ τῆς Εἰρήνης κολοσσικὸν ἐξῆιρεν ἄγαλμα. Εὐπολὶς Αὐτολύκῳ, Πλάτων Νίκαις. Thanks to John Wilkins for drawing this to my attention.

⁸⁵ Cf. Agorakritos' Nemesis and the Meidias Painter's personifications. For a possible representation of Eirene in a phlyax scene, see Kelvingrove 1903.70 (CVA GB 18, pl.46).

⁸⁶ Cf. above p.55. See MacDowell 1995, 183 on "the character of War".

⁸⁷ E.g. Sommerstein changes his mind from "Harvest" and "Festival" (Penguin, 1978) to "Fullfruit" and "Showtime" (1985).

⁸⁸ MacDowell 1995, 193: "This word (*opora*) means the season of late summer when fruit is gathered, and also the ripe fruit itself."

Eirene herself, with Dike and Eunomia, in Hesiod's alternative "political" genealogy.⁸⁹ Between them, Opora and Theoria represent "peace in the country and peace in the city".⁹⁰ Vintage is appropriately married off to Trygaïos, "Grape-harvester", at the end of the play, while Festival-going is to be given back to the Boule, the body from whom delegates were chosen to attend Panhellenic festivals.⁹¹ Eirene's connection with wine is emphasised by the chorus-leader's reference to her as "greatest and most vine-loving of all goddesses", and in Trygaïos' welcome: "O lady grape-giver, how shall I address you? Where am I to get a million-gallon word to greet you with?"⁹² As I have noted, Eirene had already been invoked in Aristophanes' *Farmers*, and her close association with agriculture in general may well have been the theme of a later *Peace*; in a fragment attributed to this, Peace's self-styled attendant Georgia seems to be complaining about the current lack of scope for her activities:

Georgia: Trusty nurse, housekeeper, fellow-worker, guardian, daughter and sister of Peace, friend of all mankind — all these things ?she used to enjoy in me?.

B: What's your name then?

Georgia: Agriculture.⁹³

This connection with agriculture, and especially viticulture, explains why Eirene's only three appearances in extant visual art of the fifth century are in the company of Dionysos.⁹⁴ On a round altar at Brauron Eirene follows Dionysos in a

⁸⁹ See Bowie 144, n.60 for references. Cf. Trendall (1989, fig. 430) for Opora and Ampelis supervising Maron handing over the wineskin to Odysseus on a Sicilian kalyx-krater (Lipari 2297).

⁹⁰ Whitman, cited in Bowie 1993, 146.

⁹¹ MacDowell 1995, 194: "Vintage and Festival-going represent the pleasures of life in peace-time, whereas Peace herself is the supernatural being who makes those pleasures possible. She deserves respect and honour."

⁹² Aristoph. *Peace* 308: τὴν θεῶν πασῶν μεγίστην καὶ φιλαμπελωτάτην. 519-21: ὦ πότνια βοτρυόδωρε, τί προσεῖπω σ' ἔπος; / πόθεν ἂν λάβοιμι ῥῆμα μυριάμορον / ὅτῳ προσεῖπω σ';

⁹³ Aristoph. fr.294 Kassel/Austin: ΓΕΩΡΓΙΑ· τῆς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποισιν Εἰρήνης φίλης / πιστὴ τροφός, ταμία, σύνεργος, ἐπίτροπος, / θυγατήρ, ἀδελφή, πάντα ταῦτ' <ἐχρήτό μοι> . / Β σοὶ δ' ὄνομα δὴ τί ἐστίν / ΓΕ. ὅ τι; Γεωργία. Stobaios' attribution of the lines to Aristophanes is problematic, as is the relationship between a later *Peace* and that of 421. A date during the Dekeleian War (Sommerstein 1985, xix-xx) would be appropriate if the play had the same "impossible peace" theme. On this fragment and the problems of the play in general see Lowe (forthcoming).

⁹⁴ As recently as 1986 Erika Simon includes in her catalogue of representations of Eirene "a gilded ivory statuette, not preserved" of 398/7 BC, probably "already known" in 422/1 BC (*LIMC* s.v. Eirene no.2). This, as Shapiro (1993, 45 n.2) points out, rests on a misreading of the inscription recording the Akropolis treasury's inventory for 398/7 (*CIG* 150b.25: Εἰρήνη ἐλεφαντίνη κατάχρυσος), which is corrected in *IG* II² 1388.75 (συβήνη ἐλεφαντίνη κατάχρυσος), but perpetuated by Jacoby (*FGH* III b, Suppl., p.421). Misreading of the unusual word ΣΥΒΗΝΗ (*aulos*-case) as ΕΙΡΗΝΗ is quite understandable (Shapiro cites a

procession of deities, all inscribed and moving towards a female figure seated on a rock (FIG. 48). The editors of *IG I³* date the altar to c.420-10 BC, though Fuchs puts it between 410 and 400; in either case it would post-date Aristophanes' incarnation of Peace.⁹⁵ Eirene is holding a flower in her left hand, between index finger and thumb, in an archaising gesture.⁹⁶ Also in the procession are Hermes and Leto, and four figures whose inscriptions are mostly illegible; Fuchs' suggested reconstructions [Θεωρ]ία, Χό[ρις] and [Ὅπ]ώ[ρα] are appealing, but given the fragmentary state of the altar they must remain speculative.⁹⁷ Eirene is just one of several maenads in Dionysos' retinue on a kalyx-krater in Vienna, of 410-400 BC (FIG. 49). While others wait on the god, she reclines on a rock, a torch leaning against her shoulder, contemplating a drinking-horn in her right hand. Eirene is more active on a contemporary pelike, formerly in Paris, where she seems to be about to embrace Dionysos as a lover (FIG. 50). In connection with this, few commentators have managed to resist the temptation of adducing a couplet from Euripides' *Bakchai* (406 BC), in which the chorus say of Dionysos, "He loves Peace, giver of prosperity, child-nursing goddess."⁹⁸ What is most interesting about the line, however, is its *mis*-match with the pelike Eirene, who is iconographically indistinguishable from any other maenad. The *Bakchai* Eirene is for the first time explicitly *kourotrophos*; the vaguely maternal Peace of Bakchylides fr.4 (τίκτει δέ..., 61) and of Euripides' *Supplikes* (τέρπεται δ' εὐπαιδία, 490) has become the "mother-figure" to be given definite form by Kephisodotos a generation later.⁹⁹

recent re-examination of the stone), but certainly does not support Simon's fanciful claim that the inscription refers to an aulos-case carved to represent Eirene.

⁹⁵ Vikelas and Fuchs 1985. A second Aristophanic *Peace* could conceivably have played further on Eirene's vinous associations by bringing Dionysos into the plot; it is tempting to attribute this and her two other appearances in his retinue to such a precedent.

⁹⁶ Cf. e.g. Artemis on *ARV²* 3, 1 (Andokides Painter, c. 525 BC); the female half of an amorous couple on *ABV* 698, under p.445, no.3 bis (Amasis Painter, c.520 BC); Aphrodite on *ARV²* 806 (follower of Douris, c.470 BC).

⁹⁷ Inscription: *IG I³* 1407 bis. On the altar see Vikelas and Fuchs 1985, fig. 1 (reconstruction of altar) and pls. 3.1 and 4.1 (Eirene).

⁹⁸ Eur. *Bacchae* 419-20: φιλεῖ δ' ὀλβοδότειραν Εἰ-/ρήναν, κουροτρόφον θεάν. Eg. Shapiro (1993, 46-7): "On an even more literal level the pairing nicely illustrates a beautiful couplet of Euripides..."

⁹⁹ Shapiro not only misses the implications of the adjective *kourotrophos*, but begs a number of questions with his "safe" assumption that Aristophanes' Eirene must have been "closer to the youthful, seductive beauty on the pelike once in Paris than to the motherly version of Kephisodotos" (1993, 50).

OUTSIDE ATHENS

Such a universal *desideratum* as peace might be expected, like health, to have been recognised as a goddess beyond the confines of Athens, but we have only a little evidence for her worship in other Greek cities. The earliest issue of coinage from Western Lokroi, dating from c.380 BC, has the head of Zeus on the obverse and on the reverse a female figure with the inscription ΕΙΦΗΝΑ ΛΟΚΡΩΝ, “Peace of Lokroi” (FIG. 51). She is quite unlike Kephisodotos’ Eirene, seated on an altar rather than standing, and holding a caduceus rather than a child. The herald’s staff is a suitable symbol for a political peace, carried by both the divine go-between Hermes and human ambassadors. Hirmer comments “the goddess on the reverse may reflect some particular peace, or she may be a deity particularly worshipped at Locri, as was Nike at Terina (...); the immediate juxtaposition of the ethnic suggests that the latter is more probable.”¹⁰⁰ The presence of the altar would also support Peace’s claim to divinity, although she does not appear again on the city’s coinage. Hirmer’s alternatives need not be exclusive; Peace may have been accorded a public cult at Western Lokroi in much the same way as at Athens, in response to a particular peace treaty. At the opposite end of the Greek world, a priest of Eirene is included in the Erythraian priest-list of c.250 BC, but we have no further information for her cult in Ionia.¹⁰¹

The Roman Peace is of course best known in connection with the *Ara Pacis*, dedicated on the 30th January 9 BC in the Campus Martius, in honour of Augustus’ victories in Spain and Gaul.¹⁰² Pax may have been worshipped at Rome earlier, as a coin of 44 BC shows her head, but the cult of Augustan Peace is a radical development, linking the idea so closely with the emperor.¹⁰³ Although the circumstances of the altar’s establishment make the cult clearly propagandistic in

¹⁰⁰ Kraay and Hirmer 1966, no.291, 313 pl. 101. Cf. no.293, stater of c.274 BC, Pistis crowning Roma, which Hirmer glosses as an affirmation of the Lokrians’ loyalty when Rome confirmed her independence after the defeat of Pyrrhos.

¹⁰¹ Dittenberger *Syll.*³ 1014.140: Εἰρήνης ... ἐπώνυμον). Other deities of note in the list are Zeus Phemios and Athena Phemia (27-8) and Ablabiai, “Freedom-from-harms” (68), which Dittenberger suggests may be a name for the Erinyes, on the parallel of the Athenian Eumenides.

¹⁰² Hopwood draws a parallel with the fact that the Athenian Eirene’s statue stood at the foot of the Areopagos, though this was probably less deliberate than the *Ara Pacis*’ positioning on the Campus Martius. He also comments on the preeminence of War: “Eirene and Pax were always minor divinities, abstractions, lacking personalities. Ares and Mars, on the other hand, both had cult and a rich mythic cycle associated with them” (1986, 207).

¹⁰³ Axtell 1907, 37-8.

origin, its widespread dissemination and long continuance suggest that the power to which it was addressed was felt to be effective. Elsner points out that two of the earliest accounts of the cults' founding, Augustus' own *Res Gestae* 12 and Ovid's *Fasti* 1.709-20, put emphasis on the rite of sacrifice, which accords with the sacrificial theme of the reliefs which adorn the actual altar. He also comments on the absence of a temple and cult statue: "Clearly, who the final recipient of any sacrifice at the Ara Pacis was to be, was deliberately left ambiguous. Among the candidates must have been Pax herself, Mars the patron deity of the Campus Martius, and not least the god Augustus whose remains were housed in the Mausoleum after AD 14..."¹⁰⁴ Such ambiguity must make Pax a less substantial figure than the independent Eirene, but was not unprecedented, as we shall see in the next chapter. The benefits brought by Augustus' Peace are much the same as those of the Athenian Eirene: whatever the identity of the central female figure on the Ara Pacis' "Tellus relief", she is surrounded by children, animals and crops (FIG. 52).¹⁰⁵ The association between peace and plenty is of course a recurrent theme in Augustan poetry, Pax and Copia themselves appearing together in Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*: *iam Fides et Pax et Honos Pudorque/ priscus et neglecta redire Virtus/ audet, apparetque beata pleno/ Copia cornu* (57-60). The "full horn of Plenty" brings us back to Kephisodotos' Ploutos, whose cornucopia is appropriated by a number of female figures in Roman art, notably Abundantia and Africa.¹⁰⁶ On a cameo dating from Tiberius' reign the cornucopia-holding female must be Pax herself, as she has the Lokroian Eirene's caduceus in her other hand (FIG. 53).

CONCLUSION

Kephisodotos' representation of Eirene and Ploutos is of a great deal "more than dusty, aesthetic antiquarian interest". Peace as a deity in the Greek pantheon is naturally conceived of in anthropomorphic terms, and that she is a woman is largely

¹⁰⁴ Elsner 1991, 54.

¹⁰⁵ Tellus, Italia and Pax herself are the most frequently cited candidates; see Zanker 1990, 172-9.

¹⁰⁶ See articles s.v. in *LIMC* I.

due to the feminine gender of εἰρήνη.¹⁰⁷ What is striking, however, is that she is holding the child Wealth. Stylistically the group is fairly conservative, but iconographically it stands in the vanguard of the fourth-century concern with the representation of “human” emotion and relationships; even if we did not know the names of the two figures, the group would be of interest as an early example of the “mother and child” motif.¹⁰⁸ The explicit linking of Eirene with Ploutos is likewise innovative, going against the mythological tradition that Wealth is child of Demeter, though a logical extension of the association between the ideas of peace and prosperity. While Kephisodotos’ group fulfils the basic requirements for an allegory, I would argue that its simplicity and rootedness in tradition put it in quite a different class from the more fully developed allegory of later periods.¹⁰⁹ The Athenian Eirene seems to bear little relation to the attribute-laden *Pax Augusta* on a bronze sesterce of Vespasian (FIG. 54): behind her is a statue of Mars, in front an altar, before which lies a pile of armour, to which she sets light with the torch in her right hand, holding an olive branch in the other. It comes as no surprise that it is this last image which caught the Renaissance imagination, as the “Pace” illustrated in Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia* shows (FIG. 55).¹¹⁰

The message of Kephisodotos’ group certainly does emphasise the potential political and intellectual aspects of a cult of Peace, but these do not invalidate her appeal as a real goddess. Burkert’s charge that a cult of Peace is “more propaganda than religion” implies that the two categories are mutually exclusive, that a cult founded in response to particular political circumstances could not have been taken seriously. This is surely to underestimate the interdependence of religion and politics

¹⁰⁷ But see Pausanias 5.16.5-6 for the sixteen married women who acted as arbitrators among the cities of Eleia, a story “perhaps encoding a message that peace and family life should prosper” (Hopwood 1986, 200). See above pp.45-55 on the gender question.

¹⁰⁸ La Rocca 1974, 130: “Secundo alcuni studiosi la novità dell’ Eirene sembra riconnettersi in principal modo a fattori contenutistici che non a fattori formali”. La Rocca can only adduce one sculptural “mother and child” group earlier than Kephisodotos’, an Eileithyia and child from Knossos, of the end of the fifth century (132-3, fig. 26).

¹⁰⁹ Shapiro outlines three main criteria for defining an allegory: the characters concerned are usually personifications, there must be some interaction between them, and some sort of message should be conveyed (1986, 6).

¹¹⁰ “Donna, che nella sinistra mano tiene un Cornucopia, pieno di frutti, fiori, frondi, con un ramo d’olivo, e nella destra una facella, con la quale abbrucci un montone d’Arme” (Ripa 1603, s.v. Pace).

in classical Athens, however.¹¹¹ As we have seen, the public cult of Eirene instituted in 375/4 was founded in honour of a goddess already familiar to the people of Athens, not only from literature but from visual representations and especially from Aristophanes' play(s). The large-scale annual public sacrifice being observed in the 330s suggests that Peace was regarded as a very real power, her worship essential to the city's welfare; if we dismiss this as mere propagandistic display, we call into question the religious credibility of all Athenian festivals.

¹¹¹ "Political motives" can be adduced for the introduction of most of the "new cults" of the sixth and fifth centuries; the bringing back of the bones of Theseus to Athens and of Orestes to Sparta are conspicuous examples, and no one questions the "reality" of these heroes to the people who worshipped them. See Garland 1992, and Parker 1996, 152-98.

Chapter 7

ELEOS: THE ATHENIAN “ALTAR OF PITY” AND ITS GOD¹

To Mercy, Pity, Peace and Love,
All pray in their distress...
William Blake²

Of all the figures I have considered so far, only Hygieia is quite without mythological roots in archaic literature; Eirene does have such a pedigree, but her fourth-century incarnation has intellectual overtones, which come to the fore in the more abstract power associated with the Roman Ara Pacis. For an extreme example of such an insubstantial figure in a Greek context I turn finally to Eleos, Pity or Mercy personified, who is one of the best attested of Greek deified abstractions due to the large body of references to the Athenian “Altar of Pity”.³ A passage from Philostratos’ *Lives of the Sophists* goes so far as to suggest that the altar’s fame was on a par with that of the Olympic Games and the Delphic oracle: a Greek slave boy writes from Babylon telling his father how he entertains the Persian king’s harem “telling stories about the fine things of Greece, how the Eleans hold their festivals, how the Delphians give oracles, what the altar of Pity at Athens is”.⁴

Identification of the altar among the physical remains of the Athenian Agora, however, presents some problems. The only viable candidate so far discovered is an altar and enclosure near the northern edge of the Agora, built in the late sixth century BC, rebuilt in the last quarter of the fifth, and further altered in the fourth century. The major problem with accepting this as the altar of Pity seen by Pausanias, our main witness for its location, is that it is fairly securely identified as an altar of the Twelve Gods. There are basically three hypotheses which have been advanced to explain this anomaly: i) the altar in the Classical Agora was originally dedicated to the Twelve Gods, but their cult was later usurped by that of Eleos; (ii) the altar of Pity was elsewhere altogether, perhaps in the area of the Roman market (iii) the Agora

¹ A preliminary version of what follows was given as a paper at the Classical Association AGM at Exeter, April 1994.

² “The Divine Image”, from *Songs of Innocence*.

³ See below for Thompson’s theory that the Ara Pacis was modelled on the Altar of Pity (1952, 79-82).

⁴ Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* 2.12.3: τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων μυθολογῶν καλὰ, πῶς Ἡλεῖοι πανηγυρίζουσι, πῶς Δελφοὶ θεσπίζουσι, τίς ὁ παρ’ Ἀθηναίοις Ἑλέου βωμός.

altar remained dedicated to the Twelve Gods throughout, but was popularly known as the “altar of mercy”.⁵ A fresh look at the literary and epigraphic sources in relation to the archaeological remains may help to answer the question: was Eleos ever really worshipped as a god, and if so where, or was ἔλεος rather merely the response sought by suppliants at an altar sacred to more conventional deities?

LITERARY SOURCES

An “altar of Pity” at Athens is attested by many writers from the mid-first century BC on, usually as a place of asylum for suppliants and as symbolic of Athens’ widely acknowledged philanthropy; I shall consider these before turning to the question of Eleos’ absence from earlier literature. Almost invariably the deification of Ἐλεος is connected with the Athenian altar, very rarely appearing in any other context; once or twice Ἐλεος seems to be referred to as Φιλανθρωπία in Greek, and in Latin the deity is called *Clementia* or *Misericordia*.⁶ Traditionally the altar has been referred to as that of “Pity”, but this translation can be misleading. In modern English there is a distinction between “pity” and “mercy”: “pity” is a feeling, the reaction of a sympathetic but powerless bystander, whereas “mercy” suggests a more active response, usually implying a certain power relationship between the seeker and giver of mercy, and often used in a religious context.⁷ A brief survey of the usage of the word ἔλεος and its cognates in Greek literature, however, suggests that this distinction was not felt in ancient Greece. ἔλεος is both the practical “mercy” sought by a suppliant, either from a god or from a fellow mortal in a position of power,⁸ and

⁵ For bibliography, see below nn.64 and 81.

⁶ See above pp.45-55, on the gender question.

⁷ My own understanding of ἔλεος is almost certainly coloured by Christian usage of the word. ἔλεος appears passim in the *Septuagint* as God’s “mercy”, as regularly implored in the liturgical response “Shew us thy mercy, O Lord, and grant us thy salvation” (Ps. 84:7; cf. v.10 for a lightly personified Mercy). In the *New Testament* the noun and cognate forms are common, indicating the very practical “mercy” of giving to the poor (Matthew 6:2-4, Luke 11:41, 12:33; the English “alms” is a corruption of ἐλεημοσύνη), or appearing in the context of people begging Christ for mercy (Mark 10:47-8), or in injunctions to the faithful to “have mercy” (Matthew 18:33, 5:7). The prayer “*Kyrie eleison*” is the only part of the liturgy to have escaped Latinisation in the Western Church.

⁸ In the *Iliad* and, to a lesser extent, the *Odyssey*, comrades “have pity” for one another by retrieving their corpses or avenging their deaths (*Il.* 5.561, 610; cf. 17.346, 352); victors may or may not “have pity on” suppliants (*Il.* 20.465, 21.74, 22.123-4, 24.44-5, 24.207; *Od.* 14.279, 22.312, 22.344); the gods may be asked to “have mercy on” suffering mortals, although more often they do so of their own accord (*Il.* 6.94, 275, 309, 9.172, 8.350, 15.12,

the “pity” aroused in an audience by a tragedy, or in a jury by a skilful orator.⁹ Given the lack of an exact English equivalent, I shall use both “pity” and “mercy” for variety, but the range of meanings of ἔλεος should be borne in mind.

The earliest reference is in a speech in Diodoros (fl.60-30 BC), put in the mouth of Nikephoros speaking in the debate on the fate of the Athenian prisoners taken at Syracuse in 413 BC. In a passage on showing generosity to others amid one’s own good fortune, he boasts that Syracuse has outdone Athens not only in military strength but even in philanthropy, concluding: “those who were first to establish an altar of Mercy will find mercy in the city of Syracuse.”¹⁰ This is a good example of the frequent rhetorical use to which Athens’ supposed generosity is put. Diodoros could, of course, have invented the altar which allows him such an elegant turn of phrase for his argument, but the lack of elaboration with which it is

44; cf. 16.431, 17.441, 19.340, 24.332; *Od.* 4.364, 5.336, 13.182, 9.349). See Crotty 1994 on *eleos* and supplication in Homer. In Sophokles’ *Philoktetes* (307-8, 501, 967) ἐλεέω always appears in the mouth of the suffering hero begging to be rescued. ἔλεος occurs once in Thucydides, in a speech, as the “mercy” that should be shown to the vanquished Mytilenians (3.40.2-3). In Aristophanes the audience are upbraided for showing no pity to the aging, drunken Kratinos now that he has lost his comic talent (*Knights* 531), but ἐλεέω generally appears in the context of supplication (*Lys.* 880-2; *Wasps* 393, 572, 880, 967); cf. *Peace* 425 for a Hermes “always merciful (ἐλεήμων) towards gold plate”. Likewise in Menander Pamphile calls on the gods to “have mercy” on her (*Epitir.* 855), though elsewhere the verb is used of characters feeling less active “pity” for one another (*Aspis* 285, *Perik.* 518, *Misoum.* 316-7). Cf. *AP* 12.42.5-6 and 232.6 for erotic epigrams burlesquing the heroic values of αἰδώς and ἔλεος.

⁹ In Euripides’ *IA* (491-2) ἔλεος appears as Menelaos’ reason for urging Agamemnon not to kill Iphigeneia, but most use of the noun is made in the *Orestes*, where it seems to mean “tragedy” (i.e. object of pity), as well as “mercy” or “pity” (333-4, 567-8, 831-3, 968-70); the helpless “pity” of the Chorus in *Phoinissai* (1284-7), when Jokasta tries to intervene between her warring sons. Plato contrasts τὰ ἔλεα with τὸ γελοῖον as the subjects represented by tragedy and comedy respectively (*Rep.* 606c5) and comments on the use of such means as bringing forward children in order to arouse a jury’s pity (*Apol.* 34c.4); men can “show pity” towards one another rather than treating the failings of others too harshly (*Prot.* 323d3, *Rep.* 415c1, 518b2), and gods can show pity for men’s shortcomings (*Laws* 665a.4, 877a.4, *Symp.* 191b.5). Aristotle employs ἔλεος and its cognates in the contexts of ethics, rhetoric and literary theory. The faculty of feeling pity is a πάθος τῆς ψυχῆς, a virtue if felt for the right people and for the right reasons (*Nik. Eth.* 1105b.23-5, 1106b.19; cf. 1109b.32, 1111a.1, 1114a.27 and *On Virtues and Vices* 1250b.324). ἔλεος is also the regular technical term for the art of arousing pity in a jury, a skill essential to the good orator (*Ars Rhet.* 1419b.25, 1354a.17, 1378a.21, 1385b.1-20, 1390a.18-21; he cites Thrasymachos’ treatise Ἐλέοι, 1404a.15). In a literary context, ἔλεος and φόβος are the two main emotions aroused by tragedy (*Poetics* 1449b.27, 1452a.3 and 38-b1, 1453.a.1 and b.1, etc.).

¹⁰ Diod. 13.22.6-7: τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐνίκησαν οὐ μόνον τοῖς ὅπλοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ... οἱ πρῶτοι βωμὸν ἐλέου καθιδρυσάμενοι τοῦτον ἐν τῇ πόλει τῶν Συρακοσίων εὐρήσουσιν.

introduced surely suggests that the idea of the altar was already current, whether or not such an altar actually existed at the time.¹¹ From later writers it seems that the Athenian Ἐλέου βωμός became quite a rhetorical *topos*, explicitly recommended by Apsines (third century AD) in a chapter on how to arouse a jury's ἔλεος, in his *Ars Rhetorica*. If speaking to Athenians, we can say: "You have an altar of Pity, and universal philanthropy for all is thought to be a god. You have a good reputation for this among all other men; so do not change your disposition now."¹² If speaking to others, we can hold up the Athenians as a praiseworthy example; instances of successful suppliants can also be adduced, such as the Herakleidai.¹³ Quintilian had already noted the usefulness of the Athenian example for Roman orators, though not mentioning the altar as such: "Or if I am recommending mercy to a judge, will it be of no assistance that the Athenians, the wisest people, understand mercy not just as a state of mind but as a god?"¹⁴

Various mythological suppliants had become associated with the altar by the second century AD, most frequently the children of Herakles, then Adrastos. Our main sources are the *Bibliothèque* attributed to Apollodoros, which may have been written at any time between the mid first century BC and the second AD, and Zenobios' *Proverbs*, of the early second century AD. Both works are compilations of stories taken from earlier writers, but unfortunately the sources for the passages we are interested in are not cited, so the age of the material cannot be established with any certainty. The *Bibliothèque* tells how, after the death of Herakles, his children were pursued by their father's old enemy Eurystheus: "Being pursued they came to Athens, and sitting at the altar of Pity they claimed assistance. The Athenians did not surrender them but supported a war against Eurystheus."¹⁵ The

¹¹ Diodoros is a prolific user of ἔλεος and its cognates: ἔλεος appears as a rhetorical effect (1.76.2, 12.18.4, 12.24.5), as an emotion like anger (3.18.5), a feeling towards kin or friends (8.8.3, 11.56.5), as "mercy" towards conquered enemies (11.32.5, 13.23.1-5).

¹² Apsines *Ars Rhet.* (Spengel I ii 307): Ἐλέου βωμός ἐστι παρ' ὑμῖν, θεὸς εἶναι δοκεῖ παρ' ὑμῖν ἢ κοινὴ πάντων φιλανθρωπία, ἐπὶ τούτῳ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις εὐδοκιμεῖτε πᾶσι μὴ οὖν ἀλλοιωθῆτε νῦν.

¹³ On the use of the Heraklid/Adrastos *topos*, see Thomas 1989, 211-2.

¹⁴ Quint. *Inst. Or.* 5.11.38: *Aut si misericordiam commendabo iudici, nihil proderit, quod prudentissima civitas Atheniensium non eam pro adfectu sed pro numine accepit?*

¹⁵ *Bibliothèque* 2.8.1: διωκόμενοι δὲ ἦλθον εἰς Ἀθήνας, καὶ καθεσθέντες ἐπὶ τὸν Ἐλέου βωμὸν ἤξιουν βοηθεῖσθαι. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ οὐκ ἐκδιδόντες αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸν Εὐρυσθέα πόλεμον ὑπέστησαν...

story appears almost verbatim in Zenobios, and the association of the Heraklids with the altar is recorded by Statius and his scholiast Lactantius, and in scholia on Demosthenes and Aristophanes.¹⁶ Philostratos claims that the Athenians received the Heraklids “at the time when they established the altar of Mercy as of a thirteenth god, not pouring libations of wine and milk but of tears and of respect towards suppliants”.¹⁷

The *Bibliothèque* also has Adrastos, leader and only survivor of the ill-fated Seven against Thebes, making supplication at the altar in the course of seeking Athenian help in retrieving the bodies of his fallen comrades: “When he arrived at Athens, Adrastos took refuge at the altar of Pity and, placing a suppliant’s branch, asked that the dead be buried.”¹⁸ Zenobios again records the same story, though at greater length; interestingly, he puts it under the heading Ἀδράστεια Νέμεσις, deriving this cult title of Nemesis from the “fate of Adrastos”.¹⁹ Adrastos is the speaker in the latest source to mention the altar, the twelfth-century Nikephoros Basilake: “I shall go to the city of Athena, I shall make my way to the altar of Pity, I shall make a libation of tears and persuade that philanthropic people.”²⁰ He goes on to call the Athenians οἱ θεὸν εἰδότες τὸν ἔλεον, “those who know Pity as a god”. The women of Argos, without Adrastos, are the suppliants at Statius’ altar of *Clementia* in a passage of the *Thebaid* which gives a history of the altar’s foundation and a long list of previous suppliants, as well as the lengthiest description of the sanctuary (see below). Statius dismisses the story that the Heraklids set up the altar as falling short of the truth, as it was the gods themselves who established the

¹⁶ Zenobios 2.61, Schol. Demosth. *Olynth.* 2.6, Lactantius on Statius *Theb.* 12.487. Cf. Lysias for an early reference to the Heraklids’ supplication at Athenian altars, although unfortunately no particular altar is specified: ἀφικόμενοι εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν ἰκέται ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν ἐκαθέζοντο (2.11).

¹⁷ Philostratos *Epist.* 39/70: ὅταν καὶ τὸν Ἑλέου ἐστήσαντο βωμόν, ὡς τρισκαιδεκάτου θεοῦ, οὐκ οἴνου σπένδοντες αὐτῷ καὶ γάλακτος ἀλλὰ δακρύων καὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς ἰκετεύοντας αἰδοῦς. The orator Demades is said to have proposed two candidates as “the thirteenth god”: Philip in 338 BC after Chaironeia (Apsines *Ars Rhet.*, Spengel 1853, 333-4/1894, 221) and Alexander in 324 BC (Aelian *VH* 5.12). Elsewhere Philostratos has the Heraklids being dragged away ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ (*Vit. Soph.* 2.1.8).

¹⁸ *Bibliothèque* 3.7.1: Ἀδραστος δὲ εἰς Ἀθήνας ἀφικόμενος ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλέου βωμόν κατέφυγε καὶ ἰκετηρίαν θεῖς ἡξίου θάπτειν τοὺς νεκρούς; see below p.218-19 on ἰκετηρία.

¹⁹ See above p.117 n.110 on Nemesis Adrasteia.

²⁰ Nikeph. *Progymn.* 7.12 (Walz *Rhet. Gr.* I 499): ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν πορεύσομαι, ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλέου βωμόν, ἐπισπείσω καὶ δάκρυα καὶ πείσω φιλόανθρωπον.

shrine.²¹ Countless people have found refuge there: those defeated in war, the exiled, kings who had lost their realms, those guilty of terrible crimes, including Oedipus and Orestes.²² It is noteworthy that the famous suppliants cited for the altar are nearly *always* mythological, the only historical people represented as availing themselves of it appearing in late sources, for whom their subjects seem to have taken on quasi-mythical status. Philostratos has the Athenians receiving Aristeides, Xenophon, Alkibiades and Demosthenes, but in the same breath mentions Demeter, Dionysos and the children of Herakles as suppliants.²³ Libanios bases a rhetorical exercise around the proposition that Demosthenes had been torn from his position as suppliant at the altar of Eleos and surrendered to Philip; later released, Demosthenes proposes to the Athenians that the altar be done away with.²⁴

But are these rhetorical flourishes and myths based on any real altar of Pity? Our best source is the indefatigable Pausanias, who tells us all about the altar and its god (1.17.1):

Among other things not well known to everyone in the Athenian Agora is the altar of Pity; the Athenians alone of Greeks pay him honour, although he is an especially useful god in human life and its vicissitudes. Not only are institutions for philanthropy established among the Athenians, but they worship gods more than others do; they even have an altar of Respect, and of Rumour and Impulse. Quite obviously, for those who have a greater share of piety than others, there is a proportionate measure of good fortune.²⁵

This passage seems clear enough, but it does raise a number of problems. Firstly, the phrase οὐκ ἐς ἅπαντας ἐπίσημα has most often been interpreted as “not well

²¹ Stat. *Theb.* 12.499-505: *caelicolas.../ sic sacrasse loco commune animantibus aegris/ confugium, unde procul starent iraeque minaeque/ regnaque...*

²² Il. 506-18. The other name Statius associates with the altar is Olynthus (*Theb.* 12.510), whose identity has so far eluded editors (none of the proposed emendations is convincing). Melville and Vessey can only suggest the eponymous hero of the city Olynthos, “but he has no recorded connection with Athens as a place of sanctuary” (1992, 365, n.320). I wonder whether a link might be made with the “Olynthian” of the Elder Seneca’s *Controversiae* (10.5.34, on which see below), though this seems fairly tenuous.

²³ Philostr. *Epistolai* 39/70.

²⁴ Lib. *Declam.* 22; see further below.

²⁵ Paus. 1.17.1: Ἀθηναίοις δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ ἄλλα ἐστὶν οὐκ ἐς ἅπαντας ἐπίσημα καὶ Ἑλέου βωμός, ᾧ μάλιστα θεῶν ἐς ἀνθρώπινον βίον καὶ μεταβολὰς πραγμάτων ὄντι ὠφελίμῳ μόνοι τιμὰς Ἑλλήνων νέμουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι. τούτοις δὲ οὐ τὰ ἐς φιλανθρωπίαν μόνον καθέστηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεοὺς εὐσεβοῦσιν ἄλλων πλεόν, καὶ γὰρ Αἰδοῦς σφισι βωμός ἐστι καὶ Φήμης καὶ Ὀρμῆς· δῆλὰ τε ἐναργῶς, ὅσοις πλεόν τι ἐτέρων εὐσεβείας μέτεστιν, ἴσον σφίσι παρὸν τύχης χρηστῆς.

known to all”, but Wycherley raises the valid objection that the mass of literary evidence suggests, on the contrary, that the altar was very well known indeed, even beyond Greece. He prefers to translate “not easily distinguishable for everyone”, emphasising the root meaning of ἐπίσημος. As he is identifying the altar of Eleos with the altar of Twelve Gods, he links the phrase with the problem of Pausanias’ route in the Agora, and comes up with the idea that Pausanias had failed to notice this “difficult to distinguish” altar earlier because it was surrounded by trees, and he only caught sight of it when taking a final look round before leaving the Agora.²⁶ Neither interpretation is entirely satisfactory, but the meaning of the phrase can perhaps be elucidated by linguistic parallels. Pausanias uses three similar expressions, all of which concern how well a thing is known: οὐκ ἐς ἅπαντας κεχώρηκεν ἡ φήμη (“the report has not spread to everyone” of all the Gauls’ campaigns, 1.4.6); τούτους οὐκ ἐς ἅπαν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐπιφανεῖς νομίζω γενέσθαι (“I do not believe that these men were famous to all the Greeks”, 5.23.7); ἔστι μὲν οὐκ ἐς ἅπαντας γνώριμα (“there are other things not well-known to everyone”, e.g. the ritual of the Arrhephoria, 1.27.3). Given such parallels we should accept the translation “not well known to everyone”. It is perhaps not necessary to read too much into the phrase, which could simply be a formulaic linking device, the kind of thing one says when telling a story.²⁷

That the Athenians alone worship Eleos is not strictly true. A small cylindrical altar found near the temple of Asklepios at Epidauros, along with several others, all marble and inscribed in the same schema, is inscribed: “Hierokles (dedicated) this altar of Mercy in obedience to a dream”.²⁸ This is, however, probably later than Pausanias, late second or third century AD, and is the only trace of any cult of Eleos outside Athens. Most commentators have relegated this altar to

²⁶ Wycherley 1959, 42-3. See further below.

²⁷ Papachatzé (1974, 256) likewise adduces the parallel of οὐκ ἐς ἅπαντας γνώριμα (Paus. 1.27.3) to dismiss argument about the phrase. Pausanias, who is one of the first to speak explicitly of Eleos as a god, uses the abstract ἔλεος a few times: Demeter “has mercy on” the childless Plemnaios by rearing a son for him (2.5.8); the Romans “were changed to mercy” for Greece and relaxed the harsh terms imposed after Mummius’ sack of Korinth (7.16.10); the heartless Kallirhoë finally relents and kills herself, out of pity for Koresos and shame at the way she has treated him (7.21.5); the Gauls are characterised as “men devoid of pity and love in their natures” (10.22.4).

²⁸ IG IV² 513 (= SIG 1149): Ἐλέου/ βωμὸν/ Ἱεροκλῆς/ κατ’ ὄναρ.

a footnote, dismissing it as dependent upon the Athenian cult, or as a poetic expression of thanks for some “mercy” received.²⁹ Another altar at Epidauros, which may have been erected by the same Hierokles, is dedicated to the rather idiosyncratic deity “Pantheios”.³⁰ Little can be established firmly from the Epidaurian altar, but it does suggest that someone outside Athens found Eleos sufficiently effective a power to merit a personal altar.

It is important here to distinguish between what Pausanias says he actually *saw* and the comments it prompts.³¹ What he saw in the Agora was a/the Ἐλέου βωμός, the rest of the passage is an enlargement on the theme taken from his own stock of general knowledge. We have other evidence to substantiate his claim that the Athenians worshipped Aidos and PHEME (though no other references for Horne), and for Athens’ general reputation for philanthropy and piety.³² But that the Athenians worship a “very useful” god called Eleos is not clearly established. Out of the thirty-seven passages which refer to Eleos at all, only ten speak explicitly of Eleos as a god, rather than just of the Ἐλέου βωμός, and of these six are later than Pausanias. Quintilian’s comment that Athens “regarded (*Misericordia*) not just as a state of mind but as a god” could well be a mere turn of phrase, the kind of hyperbole allowed by rhetorical licence, and the other references to an independent Eleos, are just as problematic.³³ Only once in extant literature is mention of Eleos made entirely outside the context of the altar.³⁴

For a more evocative description of the precinct we might go back to Statius, writing at the end of the first century AD:

²⁹ Thompson 1952, 49 n.6; Zuntz 1953, 75 n.18. Wycherley 1954, 147 gives the altar a whole four lines of text, making the rather unnecessary comment: “The dedicator no doubt had the Athenian altar in mind — indeed it apparently haunted his dreams.” As it was standard procedure at Epidauros for anyone seeking healing to expect instructions about his cure via a dream while asleep in the *abaton*, it is hardly surprising that a dedication should contain the phrase κατ’ ὄναρ.

³⁰ *IG* IV² 549.

³¹ On Pausanias and autopsy, see above pp.42-3.

³² Aidos: above p.95 n.14. PHEME: Aischines 1.128 (see above p.24 n.27), with scholium, and 2.145, Procop. *Ev.* 52 p.551.

³³ See below on Karneades, Statius, Philostratos, Apsines, Sopatros and Libanios.

³⁴ See below on Timokles. For a complete list of ancient sources for the altar of Eleos, conveniently presented in alphabetical order of author and with English translations, see Wycherley 1957.

In the middle of the city there was an altar sacred not to one of the mighty gods, but gentle Clemency had her seat there, and the wretched made it holy; she was never without a new suppliant, no prayers did she turn away or condemn. Whoever asks is heard; day and night it is possible to come and win over the goddess with complaints alone. Her rites are modest; no incense flame nor deep-welling blood are accepted; her altar is wet with tears, and above it hang sad offerings of cut hair and clothes left there when luck changed. Around the altar is a gentle grove, and the mark of venerable worship, garlanded laurels and the suppliant olive tree. There is no image, the goddess' form is entrusted to no metal; she likes to live in hearts and minds. She always has frightened people about her, the place is always swarming with needy crowds; only to the prosperous is her altar unknown.³⁵

Although this takes the form of an evocation of a *locus amoenus*, it is likely to be more than just a literary exercise. Statius' father travelled in Greece, by his son's account, winning prizes in poetic contests at Delphi, Nemea and the Isthmos, and Statius himself is likely to have visited Athens; the lapse into the present tense at 1.485 certainly suggests that the description is based on observation of a real location, however rhetorically elaborated.³⁶ The most immediately obvious point the passage raises is the question of the gender of "Pity". The fact that Statius can happily effect such a sex-change should raise our doubts about the reality of this deity, as should references to the absence of sacrifices and a cult statue. David Vessey points to the Stoic understanding of *clementia* as a personal quality (outlined in Seneca's *De*

³⁵ *Theb.* 12.481-496: *Urbe fuit media nulli concessa potentum
ara deum; mitis posuit Clementia sedem,
et miseri fecere sacram; sine supplice numquam
illa novo, nulla damnavit vota repulsa.
auditi quicumque rogant noctesque diesque
ire datum et solis numen placare querelis.
parca superstitio: non turea flamma, nec altus
accipitur sanguis: lacrimis altaria sudant,
maestarumque super libamina secta comarum
pendent et vestes mutata sorte relictæ.
mite nemus circa, cultuque insigne verendo
vittatæ laurus et supplicis arbor olivæ.
nulla autem effigies, nulli commissæ metallo
forma dei, mentes habitare et pectora gaudet.
semper habet trepidos, semper locus horret egenis
coetibus, ignotæ tantum felicibus aræ.*

³⁶ Statius *Silvæ* 5.3.141-5. Ahl 1986 argues that the passage is Statius' "thank you" to Athens for the honour accorded to him or his father by the Council of the Areopagos attested by an honorary inscription dedicated at Eleusis around the middle of the first century AD (*IG II²* 3919). He points to Athena's speech instituting the court of the Areopagos in Aischylos' *Eumenides* (681-705) as "the prototype for Statius' Altar of Mercy, open day and night: clemency dissociated from power, and from despotism or anarchy" (2891).

Clementia) underlying the passage, one of the facets of Statius' Stoicism which made Dante and others think he must have been a Christian: "Clementia is not a goddess, but a symbol of the highest virtue that can inspire humanity in a harsh and troubled world." Clementia's dwelling "in hearts and souls" strikes a particularly suspicious note, suggesting "a spirit akin to that of Christianity", with its emphasis on faith over works, rather than the externalising which is characteristic of Greek religion.³⁷

After Statius and Pausanias, evidence for a late sighting of the altar, by no less a person than the emperor Julian, is apparently supplied by Libanios. In the *Embassy to Julian* (AD 363), asking the emperor to show mercy on Antioch by continuing to use the city as his seat of government, he invokes the usual example of Athenian philanthropy towards the unfortunate: "It was not for people who in their city considered Eleos a god — whose altar you have seen in Athens, emperor — to remember the wrongs of those who called upon them and begged their help; they had either to overturn the altar or be reconciled."³⁸ Julian had a brief period of study in Athens in AD 355 when he might be supposed to have seen the altar, but this raises a problem which is relevant to all our post-third century sources: much of the Agora was destroyed in the Herulian sack of Athens in AD 267, and afterwards Athens retreated behind defences which excluded the area.³⁹ This obviously throws doubt on the location we are to assume for the altar, which is not explicitly mentioned. In the "Demosthenes" speech cited above, however, Libanios does specifically give the altar

³⁷ Vessey 1973, 310. He also makes a distinction between mercy and pity: "Mercy must, however, be distinguished from pity, which is a fallible emotion. For mercy is inseparable from justice ..." (311). On Statius and *clementia*, see Burgess 1972, who argues the case for Statius having deliberately redefined the concept in response to the contemporary political situation, reinstating *clementia* as an admirable quality for a Roman emperor, applicable to a benevolent dictatorship rather than an arbitrary tyranny (348). Susanna Moreton-Braund kindly drew my attention to this aspect of Statius' description. Evidence for the deification of *clementia* at Rome is confined to the Caesarian and imperial periods, *Clementia* always being closely associated with the ruler in question. In 44 BC the Senate decreed an altar to *Clementia Caesaris* (Appian *B.C.* 2.106, Plut. *Caes.* 57), set up statues representing Caesar and *Clementia* standing hand in hand, and instated Antonius as *flamen dialis* over the priesthood of the temple (Cassius Dio 44.6.4); again in AD 28 an *ara Clementiae* was erected in honour of Tiberius (Tacitus *Ann.* 4.74); a yearly sacrifice to Caligula's φιλανθρωπία was voted by the Senate (Dio Cassius 59.16.10). See Axtell 1987, 35 on the cult at Rome; on *Clementia* on coins of Tiberius and Vitellius, see Levick 1975.

³⁸ Lib. *Or.* 15.39: τῶν γὰρ οἴκοι τὸν Ἐλεον ἡγουμένων θεόν, οὗ τὸν βωμὸν ἐώρακας Ἀθηναῖσιν, ὃ βασιλεῦ, μεμνήσθαι τῶν τοῖς καλοῦσι καὶ δεομένοις ἡμαρτημένων οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸν βωμὸν ἀνατρέπειν ἐχρῆν ἢ διηλλάχθαι.

³⁹ For a brief history of the post-Herulian Agora, see Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 208-19.

of Eleos a location in the Agora: as Demosthenes was being led away from the altar he covered his face, “for I could not bear to look upon the statues of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, nor the Bouleuterion or the Metroon, the places where my speeches were made and my propositions voted on”.⁴⁰ The Bouleuterion and Metroon are of course on the west side of the Agora, and the Tyrannicides group stood somewhere between the temple of Ares and the Odeion, all being fairly obvious landmarks by which to designate not only the Agora but also the democratic and religious values which the character “Demosthenes” feels were being violated by his forcible removal from sanctuary (FIG. 58).⁴¹ The level of destruction caused by the Herulian invasion is a matter for some discussion. Frantz summarises the literary evidence, based on which earlier scholars had, in her view, underestimated the damage done; against this, excavation of the Agora had shown that the impact was “catastrophic”.⁴² Recent work on the period, however, is tending once more to downgrade the degree of devastation caused by the Herulii in a number of regions, and even on a more pessimistic reading of the Athenian situation, the buildings of the north half of the west side of the Agora escaped serious damage.⁴³ It is not impossible, then, that an altar situated in this area might have remained reasonably intact, nor that a tourist with such an interest as Julian’s in “pagan” religion might have been shown it.⁴⁴ Libanios may be using much rhetorical licence in his speech to Julian in general, but such a parenthetical appeal to the latter’s own experience would make little sense if the incident were entirely imaginary.

The one piece of apparently hard evidence for the physical existence of an “altar of Mercy” is a second-century AD votive relief dedicated by a Thracian family: “Supreme ruler on high, father of fruitful Peace,/ we are suppliants at your altar of Mercy ...”⁴⁵ Only part of the relief survives, showing the lower half of a man

⁴⁰ Lib. *Declam.* 22.11: οὐ γὰρ ἔφερον βλέπειν εἰς τὰς Ἀρμόδιου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος εἰκόνας οὐδ’ εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον οὐδ’ εἰς τὸ μητρώον, τὰ χωρία τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων καὶ ψηφισμάτων. Cf. FIG. 58.

⁴¹ Tyrannicides: Paus. 1.8.5; see Wycherley 1957, 93-98 for testimonia.

⁴² Frantz 1988, 1-3. Literary view: e.g. Judeich 1931, 104.

⁴³ Frantz 1988, 4 and 53-6, where she highlights the danger of attributing any signs of Late Antique destruction to the Herulii, and presents the evidence for associating much damage in the Agora with the arrival of Alaric and the Visigoths in 396.

⁴⁴ On Julian and Athens, see Frantz 1988, 20-4.

⁴⁵ IG II² 4786: ὑψιμέδων ὕπατε, πάτερ Εἰρήνης βαθυκάρπ[ου],/ σόν Ἐλαίου βωμὸν ἱκετεύομεν ἡμεῖς...

standing at an altar and the feet of a boy. This was found in the Odeion of Herodes, and is the only text suggesting an association between Eleos and another god, in this case Zeus. Unfortunately, it is not clear to what altar the inscription refers, as the relief had been moved to its find-spot from elsewhere. An altar identified by some as that of Zeus Agoraios is situated between the Odeion and the monument of the Eponymous Heroes, and another in front of the Stoa of Zeus is likely to be the altar of Zeus Eleutherios, but too little is known about them to establish a link with the inscription or our altar.⁴⁶ Papachatzke interprets the inscription as simply describing Zeus' altar as "merciful", rather than making it a candidate for the altar of Mercy. Wycherley uses the inscription as evidence for his suggestion, to which I shall return, that in the phrase Ἐλέου βωμός, Ἐλέου is "a kind of descriptive genitive" rather than the possessive.⁴⁷ The strange spelling of Ἐλαίου has been dismissed as a Thracian aberration, or explained by parallel evidence which indicates that αἰ and ε were pronounced as if the same at this period, as they are in Modern Greek.⁴⁸ No one has made the obvious suggestion that ὁ ἔλαιος (the wild olive) or το ἔλαιον (olive oil) is actually intended: "Zeus, we are suppliants at your olive-altar". This interpretation is not as far-fetched as it might at first appear, since Zeus, with Athene, is protector of olive trees, olive oil was used for libations, and the holding of an olive branch is specifically associated with supplication.⁴⁹ The link between such a supplicatory olive-branch and the altar of Mercy is explicitly made by a scholium on Aischines explaining the word ἱκετηρία: "The suppliant's branch was like this: a suppliant wreathed a stick with olive shoots and sat holding it on the altar of Mercy

⁴⁶ Pausanias sites Kephisodotos' Eirene and Ploutos as being "behind the figures of the Eponymous Heroes" (1.8.2), which would put it near the putative altar of Zeus Agoraios, and perhaps support that altar's claim to the Thracian dedication.

⁴⁷ Papachatzke 1974, 257; Wycherley 1954, 145-6.

⁴⁸ Wycherley 1954, 146: "These people could neither write hexameters nor yet spell Greek ..."; *ibid.* 1957, 74 no.190: "The misspelling of Eleos indicates a time when the pronunciation of ai had changed". Zuntz dismisses the second line of the inscription as "hopelessly corrupt" (1953, 76 n.19). For the equivalence in pronunciation of αἰ and ε from about AD 150, see Creaghan and Raubitschek 1947, 18 with n.103.

⁴⁹ Blech (1982) comments on various cases of the placing of wreaths and boughs in Greek tradition (278-94), and specifically on their use in supplication (288-92). A "suppliant's branch" is carried by Adrastus at the altar of Mercy in the *Bibliothèque* (above p.211), and in Statius Juno equips the Argive women with "branches of olive and suppliant chaplets" for their mission: *ipsa manu ramosque oleae vittasque precantes/ tradit* (*Theb.* 12.468). See below (n.52) for references to the suppliant's olive branch in tragedy.

until he obtained his rights".⁵⁰ Here the domestic olive (ἡ ἔλαια) is specified, admittedly, rather than the oleaster (ὁ ἔλαιος), but it is easy to see how confusion between an altar of supplication, indicated by ἡ ἔλαια/ὁ ἔλαιος, and an altar of Mercy might have arisen.⁵¹

So far all our sources have postdated Athens' fall to the Romans. The altar's association with the children of Herakles and Adrastos, though, suggests that it was regarded as of some antiquity, and provides an indication of where earlier references to an altar of Pity might be expected. The theme of Athenian φιλάνθρωπία towards suppliants appears in several fifth-century dramas, and scholiasts commenting on them sometimes mention the altar of Pity. Nowhere, however, does the altar appear in the play itself, despite its obvious dramatic potential.⁵²

⁵⁰ Schol. Aisch. 2.15: ἱκετηρία δε' οὕτω ἐγίνετο· ῥάβδον θαλλῶν ἐλαίας στέψας καθῆστο κατέχων εἰς τὸν Ἑλέου βωμὸν, μέχρις οὔτινος ἔτυχε τῶν δικαίων.

⁵¹ According to Plutarch, on the 6th Mounychion a procession of girls would walk to the Delphinion carrying *hiketeria* (*Thes.* 18.1); Simon (1983, 79-81) suggests that this festival was possibly called Hiketeria, corresponding to the Roman *supplicatio*.

⁵² Parallels from various tragedies based around a scene of supplication, with a group of people seeking asylum from persecutors or help against their enemies, may throw some light on what would have happened at the altar of the Twelve Gods/Eleos. Zeus seems to be the god most frequently associated with supplication, but he by no means has a monopoly. Olive branches usually play a part in the ritual, which takes place at various altars. Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*: daughters of Danaos, at Argos, seeking protection against the sons of Aigyptos, with "wool-bound shoots of suppliants" (21-2), at an altar of Twelve Gods (? "the common altar of these lords" 222-3, plural wooden images 428-30 and 465; references to Zeus Aphiktor 1, Zeus Hikesios 347, Zeus Hiktaios 385, Apollo, Athena, Poseidon, Hermes, Themis Hikesia 360). Euripides' *Suppliant Women*: Argive widows of the Seven against Thebes, seeking Athens' help in retrieving the bodies for burial, at an altar of Demeter and Persephone at Eleusis, "suppliant bough" (10); see Collard's commentary on this line for an account of supplication procedure, with references (1975, 258-62). *Madness of Herakles*: Amphitryon, Megara and the sons of Herakles, Thebes, seeking refuge from Lykos, altar of Zeus Soter (48). *The Children of Herakles*: Iolaos and the children of Herakles, Marathon, altar of Zeus; see Wilkins 1993 for literary sources for the Heraklids' flight to Attika (xiv-xv), Marathon's associations with Herakles (xxvii), and visual representations of the suppliant Heraklids (twice at anonymous altars, once at an altar of Apollo, xxxi-xxxiii). Sophokles' *OC* 466-99: although the play does not have a supplication scene at an altar as such, Oidipous clearly falls into the category of asylum-seekers, and is one of the suppliants cited by Statius for the altar of Clementia. When he has accidentally incurred the wrath of the Furies by trespassing in their grove, the chorus give Oidipous detailed instructions on the ritual he must perform to placate them (466-99). He must pour a libation of water and honey on the ground, then strew the damp earth with olive branches: "Lay upon [the earth] thrice nine olive sprays with both hands, and offer up this prayer." (483-4). Burkert (1985b) deals with the passage among other examples from Sophokles which he thinks reflect contemporary religious practice. The holding of branches, apparently, can be seen in Indo-Iranian art, where priests have branches in their hands or spread them on the ground (12). Blech (1982) comments on various cases of the placing of wreaths and boughs in Greek tradition (278-94), and specifically on their use in

A scholium on Sophokles' *Oidipous at Kolonos* explains why Oidipous sought asylum there: "Because an altar of Mercy is established at Athens".⁵³ All that appears in Sophokles, though, is a reference to Athens' famous philanthropy: "they say that Athens is most god-fearing, and alone has the power to save the wronged stranger and to help him."⁵⁴ Similarly, a scholium on Aristophanes' *Knights* tells the story, by now familiar, of the suppliant Heraklids, prompted by the word μακαρία. According to some, Makaria was the daughter of Herakles. When Eurystheus marched against Athens, and the Athenians refused to hand over the Herakleidai who had taken refuge at the altar of Pity, she killed herself, because an oracle had said that the Athenians would win if one of the Herakleidai gave himself up to a voluntary death — "as Euripides says in the *Herakleidai*".⁵⁵ But in fact Euripides makes no mention of the altar of Pity, and the play is actually set at Marathon, not Athens, the place of asylum being a shrine of Zeus Agoraios, not an altar of Mercy.⁵⁶ A possible link between the Heraklids and Athens is provided by a line in Aristophanes' *Ploutos*: Blepsiades jokingly conjures up a vision of Chremylos and Wealth surrounded by suppliants "like the Heraklids of Pamphilos" (on l.385). The scholium explains the reference as being to a painting of the suppliant Heraklids "in the Athenian stoa", but the site of their actual supplication is not mentioned.

The only appearance of Eleos in literature before Diodoros, and the only one totally independent of a reference to the Athenian altar, is a two line fragment of the fourth-century Timokles' comedy *Συνεργικά*: "Mercy is a suitable god for the dead, but to the living Envy [...] a most unholy other" (?).⁵⁷ Stobaios quotes the lines in

supplication (288-92). On sanctuaries in general as places of refuge, see Sinn 1995; figs. 5.1-3 show vase representations of suppliants sitting on altars, holding olive branches.

⁵³ Schol. Soph. OC 260: ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐλέου βωμὸς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἱδρύται.

⁵⁴ Soph. OC 260-62: ... τὰς Ἀθήνας φασὶ θεσσεβεστάτας/ εἶναι μόνας δὲ τὸν κακούμενον ξένον/ σῶζειν οἷας τε καὶ μόνας ἔχειν. In support of Athens' reputation for being φιλοικτίρμος and ἱκεταδόκος, the scholiast quotes a line of Kallimachos' *Aitia*: "She alone of cities knows how to pity" (Schol. OC 258 = Kall. fr. 51 Pfeiffer: οὐνεκεν οἰκτεῖρειν οἶδε μόνη πολίων). Hollis suggests that Book Two of the *Aitia* may have "ended with a tribute to Athens for its compassion and willingness to receive suppliants, indicated by the altar of Mercy" (1992, 6).

⁵⁵ Schol. Aristoph. *Equ.* 1151: ὥς ἐν Ἡρακλείδαις Εὐριπίδης.

⁵⁶ This is the only evidence apart from the Thracian dedication for a possible association between the altar of Eleos and that of Zeus Agoraios in the Athenian Agora.

⁵⁷ Timocles fr.33 PCG VII: τοῖς μὲν τεθνεῶσιν ἔλεος ἐπιεικὴς θεός,/ τοῖς ζῶσι δ' ἕτερον ἄνοσιώτατον φθόνος.

support of the statement “that one should not maltreat the dead”.⁵⁸ Theophilos has just the first line, to illustrate “that (the) god cares even about the dead”.⁵⁹ The second line as we have it is obviously corrupt, and a number of emendations have been suggested, the most straightforward being simply to make ἀνοσιώτατον masculine: “for the living, on the other hand, Envy is most unholy”. It is difficult to make anything of the couplet out of context, but at any rate, Eleos and Phthonos seem to be being set up as a contrasting pair: perhaps the living should feel *eleos* for the dead, while the dead feel *phthonos* for the living? That ἔλεος can be called a θεός in the context of comedy certainly need not imply the existence of a cult, but Timokles may be parodying fourth-century innovations with cults of abstractions such as Eirene.⁶⁰

A final reference to Eleos, originating with the second century BC philosopher Karneades, is an interesting passage quoted by Sextus Empiricus. It is part of a *sorites*, a type of “chain-argument” which Karneades was apparently wont to employ in criticising Stoic theology, using relentless logic to prove belief in the gods to be self-contradictory. This particular example of Karneades’ method reads: “If we declare that Aphrodite is a goddess, Erôs, being the son of Aphrodite, will be a god; but if Erôs is a god, Eleos will be a god too; for both are states of the soul, and Eleos has been worshipped in the same way as Erôs; at any rate, the Athenians have some altars of Eleos. And if Eleos is a god, so also is Phobos... And if Phobos, then all the rest of the soul’s states. But these are not gods; neither, then, is Aphrodite a goddess, though if they had been gods, Aphrodite too would have been a goddess. Therefore gods do not exist!”⁶¹ There are all sorts of objections we could raise to this argument, but for present purposes we can abstract the important aside:

⁵⁸ Stob. 4.57.8: ὅτι οὐ χρή παροινεῖν εἰς τοὺς τετελευτηκότας.

⁵⁹ Theoph. in Autol. 2.38: ὅτι φροντίζει ὁ θεὸς... καὶ τῶν τεθνεώτων.

⁶⁰ See above ch.6.

⁶¹ Adv. Math. 9.186-8: εἶγε μὴν τὴν Ἀφροδίτην θεὰν λέγομεν εἶναι, ἔσται καὶ ὁ Ἔρως υἱὸς ὦν Ἀφροδίτης θεός. ἀλλ’ εἰ ὁ Ἔρως θεός ἐστι, καὶ ὁ Ἐλεος ἔσται θεός· ἀμφοτέρω γὰρ ἐστι ψυχικὰ πάθη, καὶ ὁμοίως ἀφωσίωνται τῷ ἔρωτι καὶ ὁ Ἐλεος· παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις γοῦν Ἐλέου βωμοὶ τινες εἰσίν. εἰ δὲ ὁ Ἐλεος θεός ἐστι, καὶ ὁ Φόβος... εἰ δὲ ὁ φόβος, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς ψυχῆς πάθη. οὐχὶ δέ γε ταῦτα· οὐδὲ ἡ Ἀφροδίτη ἄρα θεός ἐστιν. εἰ δέ γε ἦσαν θεοί, κἂν Ἀφροδίτη θεὸς ὑπῆρχεν· οὐκ ἄρα εἰσὶ θεοί.

παρ' Ἀθηναίοις γοῦν Ἐλέου βωμοί τινές εἰσιν (187). The plural altars are puzzling, as nearly all our other references are to the one altar of Mercy. Wachsmuth suggested the implausible solution of there having been several altars in the one enclosure; Wycherley more sensibly posits that several Athenian altars were “known as ἔλεου βωμοί” in the second century BC.⁶² We might note that Statius also has plural altars on two occasions, although this could just be poetic licence; also, one manuscript of the Apsines passage quoted above has Ἐλέου βωμός (s.) but goes on to give examples of suppliants who had taken refuge ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν (pl.). The statement that ἔλεος is a “state of the soul” is like Quintilian’s, and suggestive of Aristotle’s categorisation of pity as one of the πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς.⁶³

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE AND IDENTIFICATION OF THE ALTAR

The enclosure which has most often been associated with the Athenian altar of Pity is situated in the north-west quarter of the Agora, beside the Panathenaic Way.⁶⁴ It was first discovered in 1891, short lengths of two walls being exposed during the digging of a deep trench for the southern retaining wall of the Athens-Piraeus electric railway. In the course of American excavations in the Agora in 1934 the area immediately south of the retaining wall was dug, uncovering the south west corner of the enclosure and a statue base inscribed with a dedication by Leagros to the Twelve Gods (FIG. 56); several pits were dug within the railway course, establishing the outline of the *peribolos*, but as the train service could not be interrupted extensive excavation was not possible.⁶⁵ Further investigation of the enclosure and its immediate vicinity was carried out in 1946, and in 1949 Margaret Crosby published a full report of the installation, identifying it as the altar of the Twelve Gods. Three years later, Homer Thompson took Crosby’s work further, positing an identification between the Altar of the Twelve Gods and the altar of Pity and suggesting a reconstruction of the parapet decorated with a group of four three-

⁶² Wachsmuth 1890, 436 n.3; Wycherley 1954, 145.

⁶³ Stat. *Theb.* 12.505-6; Aristot. *Nik. Eth.* 1105b.23-5.

⁶⁴ Wilamowitz was the first to suggest an identification between the two altars, if only in passing (1880, 201 n.4). The fundamental articles are Thompson 1952, Zuntz 1953 (*contra*), Wycherley 1954; cf. Travlos 1971, 458.

⁶⁵ Crosby 1949.

figure reliefs (FIG. 57).⁶⁶ Zuntz was quick to reply to Thompson's article, pointing out several major problems with both the identification of the altar and the suggested reconstruction.⁶⁷ At the same time Wycherley provided a more literary assessment of the identification, but was happy to follow Thompson in all but his early date for the altar's change of name. In their jointly written history of the Agora (1972) his position was restated with slightly more emphasis on the artificial nature of Eleos. No alternative identification of the altar of Pity has been suggested since then, although more doubts have been aired, and attempts have been made to locate the altar elsewhere, following Vanderpool's argument about Pausanias' route in Athens (below). This has found wide acceptance, and consequently the identification of the two altars seems largely to have been dropped, even by Thompson;⁶⁸ two recent works to be published on the Agora under the auspices of the American School make no mention of Eleos in the context of the altar of the Twelve Gods, or indeed at all.⁶⁹

Since no entirely satisfactory alternative has yet been suggested, however, the case for identifying the Agora installation as the altar of Pity deserves reassessment. The identification of the altar as that of the Twelve Gods is firmly established by the Leagros dedication: "Leagros son of Glaukon dedicated this to the Twelve Gods".⁷⁰ Thucydides tells us that "Peisistratos son of Hippias the tyrant... set up an altar of the Twelve Gods in the Agora during his archonship" and this archonship can be dated probably to 522/1 BC from a fragmentary archon-list found elsewhere in the Agora.⁷¹

⁶⁶ Thompson 1952.

⁶⁷ Zuntz 1953.

⁶⁸ The 1976 edition of the tourist guide to the Agora excavations, edited by Thompson, shows the influence of Vanderpool's argument, though the wording carefully avoids exactly equating Pausanias' Agora with the Roman Agora. The entry under "Sanctuary of the Twelve Gods" briefly explains the sanctuary's alternative identity as the altar of Pity, but concludes "It now seems more probable, however, that Pausanias came upon the Altar of Pity after he had left the area with which we are concerned... and that by 'Agora' he meant the commercial district including the Market of Caesar and Augustus to the east of our area." (98).

⁶⁹ Camp 1990 (ed.) and 1992, 40-2, although the artist's impression of the altar which he reproduces in both (*infra* FIG. 57) follows Thompson's reconstruction.

⁷⁰ *Agora* I 1597: [Λ]έαγρος ἀνέθηκεν Γλαύκονος δώδεκα θεοῖσιν. The Leagros dedication was dated to 490-80 BC by Crosby, but Francis and Vickers argue for a post-Persian date, in their revised chronology for Leagros' life (1981, 113-8), and Gadbery wants to give the base a later date on stylistic grounds, a proposition she promises to discuss in a forthcoming study (1992, 474).

⁷¹ Thuc. 6.54.6-7: Πεισίστρατος ὁ Ἰππίου τοῦ τυραννεύσαντος υἱός... τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν βωμὸν τὸν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἄρχων ἀνέθηκε. Archon-list: *Agora* I 4120. The Thucydides passage goes on to mention that "on the the altar in the Agora the people of Athens later covered up

Other literary and epigraphic sources characterise the altar of the Twelve Gods as the central point in Athens from which all distances were measured and as a place of asylum for suppliants (see below).⁷² Two fourth-century decrees order worship of the Twelve and two inscriptions record dedications to the Twelve, one by the Boule, one by a private individual.⁷³ Crosby notes as “striking” the lack of dedications later than the mid fourth century BC, but that the cult continued thereafter is firmly established by the presence of a seat “for the priest of the Twelve Gods” in the theatre of Dionysos.⁷⁴ The chronology established by Crosby from the archaeological evidence is consistent with this picture: in its first form the *peribolos* dates from the archaic period, and the moulding on fragments of the actual altar suggests the latter part of the sixth century; it was destroyed by the Persians in 479 and not rebuilt until c.430-20, after which it remained intact until the Herulian sack of AD 267; the parapet’s posts and orthostats were carefully removed at some point after the sack, perhaps to be used in the construction of the Valerian Wall or transferred to a place of safety within the new defences.⁷⁵ Recently Laura Gadbery has challenged the traditional chronology, on the grounds that it is not supported by the ceramic evidence, a problem previously explained away with the plea of disturbed stratification.⁷⁶ She suggests that the Peisistratid parapet was only renovated, not replaced, in the last third of the fifth century, with blocks from the lower sill being shifted, the interior pavement laid and the Leagros base moved to its present location. This solution allows for a later date for the building of the second parapet, agreeing with the fourth-century stratification around the upper sill, previously thought to be intrusive, and Gadbery argues for the mid fourth century, on the analogy of the monument of the Eponymous Heroes and other parallels. This date would also

the inscription by adding to the structure's length” (6.54.6-7), presumably a reference to the restoration work of the 420s.

⁷² Central point: Hdt. 2.7.1-2, *IG II²* 2640 (fifth century); cf. Pindar fr.75 SM. Shear (1994, 231) comments on the altar’s place on the early development of the Agora.

⁷³ Decrees: *IG II²* 30a.2-3 (386/5 BC); *IG II²* 112.6-9 (362/1 BC). Dedications: by the Boule, *IG II²* 2790, (357/6 BC); by Philippos of Kolone, *IG II²* 4564 (first half 4th cBC).

⁷⁴ *IG II²* 5065; see Maaß 1972, 132. Cf. topographic mention of the altar of Twelve Gods in connection with a statue of Demosthenes [Plutarch] *Vit. X Orat.* 847a. See Nünlist (1993, 250) on swearing *μὰ τοὺς δώδεκα θεοῦς* in comedy; apparently “Der Schwur ist in Griechenland noch heute gebräuchlich (Hinweis T. Gagos).”

⁷⁵ Crosby 1949.

accord with some evidence which suggests that the Twelve Gods were especially popular in Athens following the battle of Mantinea in 362 BC.⁷⁷ I have already suggested that the altar may have survived the Herulian sack, perhaps falling to Alaric at the end of the fourth century AD; any vestiges of the altar remaining would have been subsumed at the beginning of the fifth century with the erection on the site of a large square building with a colonnaded central court, possibly to be associated with the large gymnasium complex built at the same time in the southern part of the Agora.⁷⁸

The desire to identify this altar and precinct as that of Eleos stems largely from the Pausanias passage, taking in combination the fact that Pausanias omits the famous altar of the Twelve Gods and that the altar we have roughly fits the topographic requirements of his description. The fact that Pausanias does not mention the altar of the Twelve Gods ought to be significant. Of course, he omits such major buildings as the Stoa of Attalos, but that is consistent with his general dislike of the new and preference for older monuments.⁷⁹ The altar and enclosure we have are late sixth century, so within the class of things likely to attract Pausanias' interest, although he does not set out to be comprehensive, and may simply not have thought this altar worthy of note. The omission would be more satisfactorily explained, though, by the hypothesis that Pausanias' altar of Eleos is in fact one and the same as the altar of the Twelve Gods. The altar of Eleos is the last monument Pausanias mentions in the Agora, after the statues of Solon and Seleukos in front of the Stoa Poikile and before going on to the gymnasium of Ptolemy and the Theseion.

⁷⁶ Gadbery 1992. Gadbery dismisses the identification of the altar of the Twelve Gods with the altar of Eleos, following Vanderpool's argument (1992, 478, n.114).

⁷⁷ See Long 1987, 174. Euphranor's painting in the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios dates from around 360 BC, opposite his painting of Theseus with Demos and Demokratia (Paus. 1.3.3-4, Pliny *NH* 35.40.128-9; Valerius Maximus 8.11.5). The Twelve are mentioned in several decrees of the 380s and 360s, and various inscriptions record dedications to them between the late fifth and the mid fourth centuries. Both the juxtaposition of the Euphranor paintings and the inscriptions indicate a perceived link between the Twelve Gods, military victory and the flourishing of Athenian democracy. In the *Laws* (c.347 BC) Plato suggests a rationalisation of the Twelve, by assigning a tribe to each and proposing monthly sacrifices (745d-e, 828b-d). Oaths "by the Twelve Gods!" are sworn in mid-fourth century comedy by Amphis, as they had been in Aristophanes, and are again in Menander (see Long 62-83 for a full collection of references).

⁷⁸ Above pp.216-17; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 212.

⁷⁹ On Pausanias' opinion of modernity, see Arafat 1996, 36-42.

By analogy with his usual practice, it is fair to assume that he recorded these monuments in the order in which he saw them, so we would expect to find the altar just south of the Stoa Poikile — see FIG. 58 (Dinsmoor's Agora in the 2nd cAD), and compare FIG. 59 (Wycherley's Route of Pausanias). The altar of the Twelve Gods is indeed south of the Stoa, though a little way away and the other side of the Panathenaic Way; there are more obvious points where Pausanias might have introduced the altar, especially at 1.8.5, his description of the temple of Ares and various statues nearby. As previously mentioned, Wycherley accounts for this by his interpretation of οὐκ ἐς ἅπαντας ἐπισήμα as “not easily distinguishable by everyone”.⁸⁰ That this altar was difficult to make out is inherently fairly implausible because of its position right next to the Panathenaic Way, at Athens' Hyde Park Corner. As for its being obscured by trees, the whole Agora was planted with trees, as it is today, which do not seem to have prevented Pausanias from seeing the rest of the Agora's monuments; Statius' *mite nemus* (*Theb.* 12.491) need not indicate an impenetrable forest. There is no real problem, as the distance between the Stoa Poikile and the altar of the Twelve Gods is not great, and the ground in between would have been open in Pausanias' time, being mostly taken up by the Panathenaic Way. Even today, all that prevents a clear view of the *peribolos* from the site of the Stoa just north of Adrianou is the railway wall.

The most serious objection raised to this location for Pausanias' altar of Eleos is based on the fact that 1.17 is the only passage where Pausanias uses the word ἄγορά as a point of reference. Vanderpool points out that Pausanias consistently uses the name “Kerameikos” to designate what we know as the Classical Athenian Agora, as do some other late writers, and argues that therefore by “Agora” he must mean something else: “I have no doubt that the commercial market is meant, whether this be the Market of Caesar and Augustus, the old ‘Eretria’ market, or some other area”.⁸¹ If the altar of Eleos were to be located actually in the Roman Agora, we would have a slight problem of chronology. The Roman market, 150m to the east of the old Agora, was begun with money provided by Julius Caesar some time in the late

⁸⁰ Wycherley 1959, 42-3.

⁸¹ Vanderpool 1974, 308. See Wycherley 1957, 221-4 on uses of the name “Kerameikos”.

50s BC, and completed under Augustus around 11-9 BC;⁸² as we have seen, the earliest literary source for the altar of Pity is Diodoros (fl. 60-30 BC), where it is referred to as though already a familiar rhetorical trope. We might suppose that the altar was situated in the open area which preceded the Roman Agora, but it must have pre-dated the construction of the peristyle colonnade. The assumption that the area was previously an open market is based primarily on the placement of the Tower of the Winds (c.150-25 BC), which was presumably designed to be seen by a large number of people, and such a situation would not be unsuitable for our altar of Mercy.⁸³ The area's pre-second century history is unclear, however, whereas literary and archaeological evidence give a picture of trading activities carried out rather chaotically in and around the Classical Agora rather than in any clearly defined market area.⁸⁴ The altar of Mercy we have seen described as refuge of the Herakleidai and of Adrastos ought to be located somewhere more immediately accessible and of more obvious political centrality than such a vague general trading space. In any case, sources besides Pausanias strongly suggests a location for the altar in the Agora, the political heart of the city. Statius places it *urbe media*, and the Argive women step from the altar of Clementia to watch Theseus' triumph, which surely would have been envisaged as processing in through the Dipylon Gate and along the Panathenaic Way towards the Akropolis.⁸⁵ Libanios' Demosthenes clearly places the altar in the Agora, within view of the Bouleuterion and the Tyrannicides, as we have seen. Sopatros, another fourth-century orator, also depicts Demosthenes as saying to Philip: "You see how the Athenians worship Eleos along with Athena Polias, you see how they build an altar of Philanthropy on the Agora."⁸⁶ Vanderpool does not look into the dramatic context of the Statius passage, merely commenting that the market area "could be fairly described as 'in the middle of the city'", and does not consider the two later sources at all.⁸⁷ While his interpretation may make Pausanias' route easier, placing the elusive gymnasium of Ptolemy and sanctuary of

⁸² On the early history of the Roman Agora, see Hoff 1989.

⁸³ Hoff 1989, 1 and nn.2-3.

⁸⁴ For references and discussion, see Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 170-3.

⁸⁵ *Theb.* 12.481 and 519-544.

⁸⁶ Sopatr. *Διαίρεσις Ζητημάτων* 377: ὁρᾷς ὥς Ἀθηναῖοι μετὰ τῆς Πολιάδος προσκυνοῦσι τὸν Ἑλεον, ὁρᾷς ὥς οὗτοι βωμὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς φιλανθρωπίας ἀναπλάττουσιν.

⁸⁷ Vanderpool 1974, 309.

Theseus (1.17.2) in the area of the Roman market, the altar of Eleos is more of a stumbling block than he allows.⁸⁸ Neither does Vanderpool's solution do justice to Pausanias' phraseology, which suggests that he is merely resuming his description where he left off, i.e. in front of the Stoa Poikile, rather than moving on to a new area: Ἀθηναίοις δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ ἄλλα ἐστὶν...

Apart from Pausanias, a strong link between the two altars is their common function as places of refuge for suppliants. We have already seen much supplication at the altar of Eleos, but there are also a number of events associated with the altar of the Twelve Gods characterising it too as a place of asylum. Herodotos tells us that the Plataians made supplication there in 520/19 BC when asking for Athens' help against Thebes.⁸⁹ Diodoros relates that "Some of Pheidias' fellow-workers, harassed by the enemies of Perikles, sat on the altar of the gods";⁹⁰ Plutarch records that Menon, one of the said "fellow-workers", was persuaded to sit as a suppliant ἐν ἀγορᾷ.⁹¹ Incidentally, Plutarch also tells us how the Athenians failed to take note of the "manifest and obvious signs" which should have warned them against the Sicilian expedition — these bad omens being the notorious mutilation of the Herms, and "the incident at the altar of the Twelve Gods: a man suddenly leapt up onto it, then, astride it, castrated himself with a stone."⁹² Lykourgos, writing in 330 BC, cites a "justified" violation of the altar supposed to have taken place a couple of decades earlier: "Who of the older men does not remember, and of the younger men has not heard, how Kallistratos, whom the city condemned to death, fled; but when he heard from the god at Delphi that if he came to Athens he would be treated according to the laws, he returned and took refuge at the altar of the Twelve Gods, but was

⁸⁸ See Shear 1994, 228 and fig. 1 on the location of the Theseion.

⁸⁹ See Fehling (1989, 231) on the significance of the figure 12 in Herodotos.

⁹⁰ Diod. 12.39.1: τῶν δὲ συνεργασαμένων τῷ Φειδίᾳ τινὲς διενεχθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν τοῦ Περικλέους ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ τὸν τῶν θεῶν βωμόν.

⁹¹ Plut. *Perikles* 31.

⁹² Plut. *Nikias* 13.2: τὸ πραχθὲν περὶ τὸν βωμόν τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν. ἄνθρωπος γάρ τις ἐξαίφνης ἀναπηδήσας ἐπ' αὐτὸν εἶτα περιβὰς ἀπέκοψεν αὐτοῦ λίθῳ τὸ αἰδοῖον. Given the altar of the Twelve God's establishment by a Peisistratid and its function as a central milestone, there may well have been a perceived association between it and the Herms, said to have been set up by Hipparchos (Pseudo-Platonic *Hipparchos*); if so, the desecration of both at the same time would be rhetorically appropriate. See Osborne 1985 for a full discussion of our meagre evidence on the Herms.

nevertheless put to death by the city.”⁹³ Lykourgos tells this story as an illustration of how the gods make sure wrongdoers are punished in the end: the oracle acted rightly in telling Kallistratos that he would τεύξεται τῶν νόμων, “for fair treatment according to the laws, in the case of wrongdoers, is punishment”.⁹⁴ The oracle’s advice may have been a little misleading, but it would not be fitting for malefactors to receive the same revelations as good men. This similarity of function of the two altars, of the Twelve Gods and of Eleos, adds weight to the idea that they were in fact one and the same thing. I do not think our evidence can be taken as conclusive either way, but the case for the identity of two altars is certainly strong, stronger, I would suggest, than Vanderpool’s case for relocating Pausanias’ ἀγορά and hence pushing the altar of Eleos into some other marketplace.

Thompson’s article remains the fullest attempt to identify the two altars with one another, so I shall summarise it briefly. His identification of the altar with that of Eleos is based on a positive evaluation of the literary sources already discussed. He takes the Heraklid story as suggesting that the altar of Eleos was generally considered to be of great antiquity, and supposes that an original ancient altar was transplanted from elsewhere to the *peribolos* designed for the Twelve Gods; as a date for the introduction of Eleos’ cult he suggests the last quarter of the fifth century, when the enclosure was rebuilt. Having established the identification, Thompson goes on to propose an ingenious reconstruction of the parapet. Combining the requirements of dimension, style (concordant with a late fifth century date), and thematic appropriateness, he builds up a case for associating the monument with the four three-figure reliefs identified as a group by Götze (FIG. 60). He finds the Sicilian disaster of 413 BC a suitable occasion for the erection of the parapet, agreeing with the reliefs both in date and in “reversal of fortune” theme. Finally he

⁹³ Lyk. *Leok.* 93: τίς γὰρ οὐ μέμνηται τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἢ τῶν νεωτέρων οὐκ ἀκηκοε Καλλίστρατον, οὗ θανάτον ἢ πόλις κατέγνω, τοῦτον φυγόντα καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἀκούσαντα ὅτι ἂν ἔλθῃ Ἀθήναζε τεύξεται τῶν νόμων, ἀφικόμενον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν καταφυγόντα, καὶ οὐδεν ἦττον ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἀποθανόντα; This seems to be the only account of the death of Kallistratos of Aphidna, who fell from favour and was condemned to death in absentia in 361. He returned to Attika from reorganising the finances of Macedonia for Perdikkas II in 356/5 BC, which is presumably when his sentence was carried out.

⁹⁴ Lyk. *Leok.* 93: τὸ γὰρ τῶν νόμων τοῖς ἡδίκηκόσι τυχεῖν τιμωρία ἐστίν.

points out a number of correspondences between the altar of Pity and the Roman *Ara Pacis*, suggesting that the latter may have been modelled on the former.

This is quite compelling at first reading, but there are problems with Thompson's argument. Among other ideas, he suggests that the Twelve Gods, usurped from their altar, received "compensation" in the shape of Euphranor's mural depicting them in the Stoa of Zeus; but surely a wall-painting would hardly make up for the loss of a full-scale cult.⁹⁵ He defines the Athenian conception of pity as "comparatively simple and close to our own: compassion inspired by the misfortunes common to human life, and philanthropy, especially towards strangers in distress."⁹⁶ The literary sources, he claims, stress pity aroused at situations caused by a reversal of fortune (this seems to be based on Pausanias' μεταβολὰς πραγμάτων and Statius' *mutata sorte*, 1.490); and the themes of the reliefs can all be fitted in to the reversal of fortune pattern (though some ingenuity is needed with the Hesperides panel). But as Zuntz objects, the reversal-of-fortune theme is essentially tragic, and has little to do with suppliants obtaining mercy; the victims on the reliefs may deserve pity, but the whole point of the four stories would be lost if they had actually got any. My earlier point about mercy and pity not being synonymous is valid here: Zuntz suggests that Thompson "is the victim of his native language", and should try substituting the word "merciful" for "pitiful" in describing the reliefs' themes to demonstrate the difference.⁹⁷

At the beginning of her article on the Orpheus relief, Lori-Ann Touchette usefully gives a synopsis of theories advanced so far about the three-figure reliefs.⁹⁸ That they form a group is generally agreed, but what edifice the originals adorned and how the scenes represented should be interpreted has been much disputed. Thompson's attribution of the reliefs to the altar of the Twelve Gods/Pity has been criticised on technical as well as iconographic grounds. Langlotz argues that the

⁹⁵ Thompson 1952, 47 and 50. Cf. Thompson 1937, 69.

⁹⁶ Thompson 1952, 67.

⁹⁷ Zuntz 1953, 82. He objects even to the identification of the altar as that of the Twelve Gods, which he thinks was too important to be "hidden away in a small precinct on the edge of the Agora" (71-2). This suggests he has not noticed that the altar is situated just inside the main entrance to the Agora, right beside the Panathenaic Way, a position ideal for drawing attention.

⁹⁸ Touchette 1990.

foundations of the second parapet would not have been strong enough to support relief slabs and suggests, more convincingly, that the panels belonged to a four-sided funerary monument to an Attic tragedian. Touchette agrees that the altar of Pity is an unlikely candidate for their provenance, but suggests that more work needs to be done on the individual reliefs before the significance of the group can be understood and a monument identified as their home.⁹⁹ In this connection a passage from the elder Seneca's *Controversiae* is interesting. In an imaginary case, the Athenian painter Parrhasios has acquired as slave an old man captured when Philip sacked Olynthos (348 BC), and tortured him to death, as a model for a painting of Prometheus. Having put the painting up in the temple of Athena, Parrhasios is being prosecuted for harming the state. One of the prosecutors ironically suggests "If you think it right, decorate the altar of Pity with such gifts!"¹⁰⁰ Thompson fails to note the irony and cites this as support for the idea that reversal-of-fortune pictures are suitable decoration for an altar of "Pity".¹⁰¹

Putting aside the matter of the reliefs — which is interesting, but incidental to the main issue of identifying the altar — there are a number of problems with the very idea of an altar sacred to the god Eleos. That there should be an altar to a deified abstraction in the Athenian Agora is not inherently unlikely, as we have already seen. Demos and Demokratia featured in paintings and sculpture of the fifth and fourth centuries in the Agora, and actual worship of abstractions is attested from the fourth century with the Eirene, Demokratia and Agathe Tyche of the Lykourgan skin-sale records.¹⁰² Eleos, however, is a rather different case from the figures we have considered so far: Ἐλεος is not known as the cult title of any other god, nor is he generally associated with any one Olympian, he has no mythological role, and even as

⁹⁹ Apparently Thompson himself no longer believes the three-figure reliefs to belong to the altar. Shapiro (1989, 133-141) accepts the reconstruction, with the modification of Harrison's (1964) explanation of the reliefs as all linked by the theme of "the quest for the eternal good". For a survey of "Orpheus in art", see Jesnick 1992, 29-73

¹⁰⁰ Seneca *Contr.* 10.5.34: *Si videtur tibi, istis muneribus aram Misericordiae orna.* On Parrhasios' place in the history of erotic art, see Myerowitz 1992.

¹⁰¹ Thompson 1953, 57-8.

¹⁰² Thompson cites Nemesis at Rhamnous as a parallel for a fifth century sanctuary devoted to a "pure abstraction" (1952, 67); cf. above pp.96-100 on Nemesis' mythological role. Demos and Demokratia: Alexandri-Tzahou 1986 and 1993. On the skin-sale inscription, see above p.189.

a literary figure he has virtually no precedent.¹⁰³ No dedications to Eleos have been found at Athens, and literary sources make no mention of any trappings of cult apart from the altar; indeed, Statius, Philostratos and Nikephoros make a virtue of the fact that Eleos has no priest, no cult statue, and receives no sacrifice but the “libation of tears”. Should we take it that all our literary sources are indulging in poetic/rhetorical licence, speaking of an altar that never existed? Zuntz suggests that the stories of supplication at the altar of Pity might have been canonised by some authoritative version, like Kallimachos *Aitia* II, cited by the *OC* scholiast (above).¹⁰⁴ But if Kallimachos had specifically mentioned the altar, surely the scholiast would have quoted those actual words rather than the general statement that Athens “knows how to pity”. The sheer weight of evidence and the variety of contexts in which the altar appears makes it seem unlikely that its existence depends solely on a single literary source. If nothing else, Pausanias’ account certainly suggests that all the other references are based on something more tangible than literary tradition.

If we are to believe in Eleos as a real god actually worshipped in the Agora, we have two options. We might postulate the existence of another altar as yet undiscovered, most likely in the north-eastern part of the Agora, around the Stoa Poikile and immediately to the south, much of which lies under Adrianou and the railway area. This is not impossible, although for two cults so similar in function to exist side by side in such a small area seems something of a coincidence, and does not explain Pausanias’ omission of the Twelve Gods. Alternatively, we might argue that Eleos took over from the Twelve Gods, in which case we would have to find a new home for their cult and find a date and occasion for the change. Thompson’s suggestion of the Sicilian disaster fits very well with his conception of the nature of the altar, shaped by his hypothesis about the three-figure reliefs, but if we agree that mercy is not the same as pity, the occasion seems singularly inappropriate: the Athenians certainly did *not* find mercy in the city of Syracuse, whatever Diodoros says. We might look instead for some outstanding instance of Athenian *φιλανθρωπία* towards a conquered enemy, or towards an unfortunate individual or

¹⁰³ The Thracian dedication (above pp.217-18) mentioning Zeus’ “altar of mercy” is exceptional.

¹⁰⁴ Zuntz 1953, 79.

group who had sought Athens' help. The city might have dedicated an altar to Eleos to congratulate itself, or the recipients might have financed the altar by way of thanks for the help received.¹⁰⁵ But in such a case why conjure up a completely new god rather than make a dedication to Athena as embodiment of Athens, or to Zeus Ἰκέσιος?¹⁰⁶

Wycherley's view of the problem, based on a more critical consideration of the literary sources than Thompson's, provides an alternative solution, though his evident admiration for Thompson's hypothesis sometimes leads him to obfuscation. He begins by accepting Thompson's identification of the altar and attribution of the reliefs as "both attractive and convincing", and though wanting to set a much lower date for the name "altar of Pity", he compromises with the idea that "the altar may well have been in spirit an ἐλέου βωμός long before it was in name ὁ τοῦ Ἐλέου βωμός." Inspired by the Sextus Empiricus quote (above), he suggests that several altars in second century BC Athens were known as ἐλέου βωμοί, as a general term for altars much frequented by suppliants, and that the altar of the Twelve Gods simply became the preeminent ἐλέου βωμός by the time of our earliest sources. So "of mercy" should be thought of with a small m, and is "a kind of descriptive genitive. But from the beginning the possessive sense would inevitably suggest itself"; perhaps this is how Eleos "gained his somewhat nebulous divinity".¹⁰⁷ While postulating that "altar of mercy" is only a name, however, Wycherley is unable to rid himself of the idea that Eleos has a cult and some claim to divinity: "undoubtedly the

¹⁰⁵ Alan Griffiths suggests that, given the Plataians' early association with the altar of the Twelve Gods as the first recorded suppliants to take refuge there, later dealings between the two cities might have provided the occasion for the altar's change of name. Suitable occasions for the Plataians to make some sort of gesture involving the altar of the Twelve Gods might be: i) Gratitude for the safe haven provided by Athens, and especially the granting of Athenian citizenship, c.428 BC. ii) On their return to Plataia in 386, "thank you for having us". iii) On coming once more as refugees in 373 — "We keep coming and supplicating at this altar, and this is now the third time you've taken pity on us: it should be called the altar of Pity!" iv) After the battle of Mantinea (362 BC), when presumably the Plataians were among Athens' allies against the Boiotians and their allies, coinciding with Gadbery's chronology and Long's idea of the Twelve Gods' popularity at this period. See Hammond 1992 for an outline of Plataia's "special relationship" with Athens from 520/19 to 338 BC.

¹⁰⁶ See Farnell (1896-1909, I 67) for Zeus as god of suppliants; the only references for a Zeus Ἰκέσιος at Athens are Aisch. *Suppl.* 385, 413, 479 and Pollux 8.142.

¹⁰⁷ Wycherley 1954, 143-5.

later Athenians considered Eleos a god".¹⁰⁸ In a later article Wycherley is more explicit, stating that the name "altar of Eleos" is "a somewhat artificial title given to another cult", i.e. that of the Twelve Gods; that Pausanias "failed to observe the true nature of the cult and the history of the altar" can be paralleled by his apparent ignorance of the remarkable history of the nearby temple of Ares.¹⁰⁹ By the time of his joint publication on the Agora with Thompson, Wycherley feels able to make the relatively bold statement: "It has been generally recognised that 'Altar of Eleos' is merely a name attached to an earlier shrine. Eleos appears in our numerous authorities as a poetical and sentimental abstraction, a rhetorical metaphor, rather than a genuine old deity."¹¹⁰

CONCLUSION

Literary sources from the fifth century on, then, establish an Athenian reputation for *φιλανθρωπία*, expressed particularly in the helping of suppliants seeking "mercy". But, with the exception of the Timokles and Karneades fragments, Eleos is only personified from the mid first century BC, and always in the context of an "altar of Eleos". The only altar so far discovered which could possibly be that of Eleos dates from the late sixth century, and is reasonably identified as belonging to the Twelve Gods. Further excavation may yet reveal an alternative candidate for the altar of Mercy, but the contradictory material is already quite plausibly explained by a version of Wycherley's hypothesis. I suggest that Eleos was never a "real" god at all, a god actually worshipped, receiving sacrifices and dedications from historical people, and is regarded as a deity only within the confines of rhetoric. The enclosure and altar beside the Panathenaic Way in the Agora remained sacred to the Twelve Gods from its dedication by Peisistratos in 522/1 BC until its destruction probably in the late fourth century AD. This altar acquired the name "altar of mercy" because of its function as a place of supplication, and the name stuck, being a useful shorthand

¹⁰⁸ Wycherley 1954, 147. Zuntz 1953, 78 touches on the same idea, that "altar of Pity" was an alternative name for an altar "where pity was sought", but he does not elaborate.

¹⁰⁹ Wycherley 1959, 41.

¹¹⁰ Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 135. Cf. Hamdorf 1964, 65: "Es ist ungewiß, ob 'Mitleid' als Personifikation verehrt wurde: vielleicht bezeichnete der Begriff nur den Hauptaspekt der hier verehrten Götter".

for the rather longwinded τῶν δωδέκα θεῶν βωμός, and providing a focus for expositions of Athens' philanthropic reputation.¹¹¹ It is even possible that the change of name was facilitated by the morphological proximity of ἐλέου and ἐλαίου: what started out as the altar "of supplication", symbolised by the olive branch, became the altar "of mercy", the object of supplication. It would be impossible to put an exact date on what may anyway have been a gradual process, but the striking lack of reference to the name "altar of mercy" in Lykourgos' description of a merciless violation of the altar of the Twelve Gods could certainly be taken to indicate that the name was not yet current by 330 BC, and the silence of our sources before the mid first century BC would generally suggest a relatively late date for the development. By the time we have unequivocal references to Eleos as a god, rather than the phrase "altar of *eleos*", allegory had become highly sophisticated both as a mode of expression and as a tool for interpretation.¹¹² Orators and other writers seized on the idea of the altar of Mercy and exploited its emotive potential in seeking to arouse their audience's sympathy or gain a judge's mercy; if they sometimes call Eleos a god, they do not necessarily mean any more than that mercy is a "divine" quality.

The Athenians are merciful, I maintain. When? And towards whom? Whenever a city seeks an alliance, or a stranger comes as a suppliant, they believe Mercy to be a god towards these people.¹¹³

¹¹¹ As a parallel for this kind of suppression of a deity's original name in favour of what was at first an epithet, we might note the modern Greek usage of Παναγία and, appropriately here, Ελεούσα as names for the Virgin Mary.

¹¹² Cf. Philostratos *Epist.* 13/59 for a very metaphorical altar of Eleos: "Do not burn me then, but save me, and keep the altar of Pity in your heart" (μὴ καίε οὖν, ἀλλὰ σῶζε, καὶ τὸν Ἐλέου βωμὸν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἔχε). On allegory, see especially Whitman 1987.

¹¹³ Lib. *Declamatio* 16.47: ἐλεήμονες Ἀθηναῖοι, κἀγὼ φημι. πότε; καὶ πρὸς τίνας; ἂν ποτε συμμαχίας δέηται πόλις, ἂν ἰκετεύῃ ξένος, πρὸς ἐκείνους θεὸν τὸν Ἐλεον νομίζουσι.

CONCLUSION

Let me now, finally, return to the general questions about Greek cults of deified abstractions as a class with which I began. Each of my six case-studies has examined the origins and early development of the cult in question, and attempted to assess the particular personification's place in the local pantheon and her "reality" for the worshipper. In every case except that of Eleos this enquiry has been facilitated by the figure's appearances in literature and the visual arts, appearances for which, in turn, the demonstrable existence of a cult has implications. Underlying the investigation has been the constant question of how the balance is struck in each character between the "mythological" and "rational" elements inherent in the very existence of the cult of a deified abstraction. Perhaps the first thing which should be said is that no single model can be universally applied to explain the workings of all Greek personification cults, and even a single figure may follow different patterns of development in different places and at different times. Some generalisations can be made, however, although these conclusions must remain provisional until more cults have been studied in detail.

The most vexing question remains that of the origins of personification cults. In its simplest form the "epithet theory" cannot be demonstrated to work for any of our figures in a single location. Even where cult titles including a personification are attested, the direction of development is seldom straightforward — at Athens Themis appears long before a Ge Themis, and Athena Hygieia continues to be worshipped after the arrival of an independent Hygieia. A looser version of the theory might be applied, however, in cases where a personification has a consistently close affiliation to a particular Olympian deity. This can be seen most clearly with Peitho and Aphrodite, the former rarely appearing in cult, art or literature without the latter, lending credibility to the theory that Peitho began life as an aspect of Aphrodite's influence, gaining independence as that aspect increased in importance for her worshippers. This does not mean, though, that Peitho was ever literally a cult title of Aphrodite in Athens, where she is first relatively securely attested, or that once "liberated" she took on a fully independent role all over the Greek world, as the existence of Hellenistic Aphrodite Peithos on Lesbos and Knidos demonstrates. The

similarly close association maintained between Hygieia and Asklepios in cult suggests that Health was seen as an aspect of the hero-deity's influence, but the relationship was expressed as a father-daughter one rather than in terms of a cult title. Mark's hypothesis¹ that Athena Nike represents the annexation by Athena of an earlier cult of Nike cannot, unfortunately, be supported by any parallel from the current study, which rather tends towards the more traditional view that Victory, like Health, was seen as one of Athena's many areas of competence — although the ubiquitous presence of Nikai in art from the archaic period on suggests that this particular aspect of the goddess' power had extraordinary prominence. Nemesis, Eirene and Eleos have no particular Olympian associate from whom they might plausibly be derived, while the hypothesis that Themis somehow emanated from Gaia is not only unsubstantiated, but also undermined by her alternative associations with Zeus and Nemesis.

Another way in which a personification might be “eased into” cult is offered by Burkert's proposed progression from the literary appearance of a figure via visual representation to worship in a particular locality.² Certainly the mythological roles played by Themis and Nemesis in archaic literature make their appearances in cult more readily explicable; Peitho's place in myth is slighter, but her role as Aphrodite's assistant is given substance by her appearances in art from the beginning of the fifth century, and even Eirene has some literary and visual existence before her entry into cult. However, Burkert's case relies on the assumption that the personifications of epic are creations of poetic imagination, rather than figures known to the poet from cult. As I have argued, some sort of case can be made for Themis' cult in Thessaly pre-dating her earliest literary appearance in Homer, and for Nemesis' worship at Rhamnous giving rise to her appearance in the *Kypria*. These cases are difficult to substantiate because of their potential antiquity, but, in a better-documented period, Hygieia is certainly a significant exception to Burkert's rule: she is only portrayed in Attic literature and art after the introduction of her cult to Athens.

This direct entry into cult may perhaps be explained by the more personal impact of the concept Hygieia personifies, bringing us back to the “great power

¹ Above pp.60-1.

² Above p.62.

theory” put forward by Cicero’s Balbus: such things as Health are so strong they must have inherent godhead.³ If Themis and Nemesis were not simply products of a poet’s imagination, their cults require some such explanation too, although since neither represents a concept which is so obviously a universal *desideratum* as health, they need to be understood in the context of particular historical circumstances. Quite why Themis should be deemed so important in archaic Thessaly is difficult to reconstruct, or Nemesis in sixth-century Rhamnous, but the flourishing of the Attic sanctuary in the last third of the fifth century can clearly be associated with Persian-War-related propaganda, to which the concept Nemesis embodies is so apposite. Nemesis is one of a number of personifications who seem to have been particularly popular at Athens during the Peloponnesian War. This apparent proliferation of figures must in part be due to the amount of drama we have preserved from the period and the predilections of the Meidias Painter and his school, but the latter can in turn be explained as part of a general escapist trend in vase-painting. The popularity of personifications in the period can also be seen in the context of a search for “new” deities to compensate for the poor performance of the traditional gods. Clinton cites Thucydides’ description of the Athenians’ despair in the face of the apparently incurable plague in 430 — “All the supplications at the sanctuaries and all inquiries at the oracles and such things were of no help, and finally the people gave them up, overcome by the evil” — and suggests this might account for the Eleusinian officials’ interest in importing Asklepios’ cult, to revive the Two Goddesses’ reputation; the adoption of Hygieia certainly makes sense as a response to the doctors’ inadequacy in finding a cure.⁴ Similarly, Eirene’s portrayal in the drama and art of the period is demonstrably a response to the political circumstances, facilitating her further step into cult in the early fourth century when peace was still badly needed. As Alexandri-Tzachou declares, commenting on Demokratia’s place in fourth-century iconography and cult: “Each generation personified the concepts of greatest significance to its age.”⁵

³ Above p.57.

⁴ Thuc. 2.47.4: ὅσα τε πρὸς ἱεροῖς ἰκέτευσαν ἢ μαντείοις καὶ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις ἐχρήσαντο, πάντα ἀνωφελῇ ἦν, τελευτῶντές τε αὐτῶν ἀπέστησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ νικώμενοι. Clinton 1994b, 32.

⁵ Alexandri-Tzachou 1993, 149. Stewart (1997, 148-51) sees the War period as when Athens really adopted the personification as “a mode of figuring the body politic”.

If the origins of personification cults can generally be seen to lie in the importance of the concepts embodied to particular communities at particular times, we need to ask whether their obvious narrow connection to a particular abstract idea affected their status as gods. For those personifications who have a mythological role, or a close association with an Olympian, the answer must surely be that they were thought of as existing in the same sphere as the gods, even if they were subordinate in the hierarchy — how else could Themis be Zeus' adviser and Nemesis object of his desires, or Peitho be in Aphrodite's retinue and Hygieia Asklepios' daughter? As we have seen, all of these appear in the visual arts looking much like any other goddess of the appropriate period, and, when it comes to votive reliefs, where a distinction of size is made between mortals and deities, on the divine scale. In a number of cases in literature, too, a personification is explicitly designated *θέα*, or invoked in hymn form, with no suggestion that this attribution of divinity is in any way problematic. Above all, though, the religious "reality" of personifications is demonstrated by the practical elements of cult activity with which they were honoured. Private dedications to Themis, Nemesis and Peitho certainly suggest that these figures were taken very seriously as deities by ordinary worshippers, as does the performance context of Ariphron's hymn to Hygieia. At a different level, the publicly-financed festivals of Nemesis at Rhamnous and Eirene at Athens are incontrovertible testimony of these goddesses' significance for the community, that of Eirene being listed alongside two of the Athens' most major annual events, the Panathenaia and the City Dionysia. State approval can also be seen in the presence of seats for the cult personnel of Themis, Nemesis and Peitho in the Theatre of Dionysos. This is not to say that no one in the ancient world recognised a distinction between personifications and the Olympian gods — we have seen the comments of Cicero, the Elder Pliny, Juvenal, and especially Lucian on the subject.⁶ But it remains remarkable that earlier criticisms of traditional religion do not appear to have recognised personifications as a separate class — a lack of categorisation apparent in the very term *prosopopoiia*.⁷ Veyne's question "Did the Greeks believe in their myths?" has basically to be answered "Yes", with due allowance for different modes

⁶ Above pp.56-8.

⁷ Above pp.23-5.

of belief, and I would argue that personifications were “believed in” in just the same way as the rest of the Greek pantheon — rationally by the analytically inclined, perhaps, but respected as powerful by the vast majority.⁸

I have already questioned Burkert’s assumption of the primacy of literature and suggested that the presence of a personification cult in a particular location might sometimes be what prompts an author to represent the figure in a literary or visual medium (Nemesis and the *Kypria*, Hygieia and the Meidias Painter’s name vase). Individual cases are likely to remain inconclusive, as our evidence for cult only rarely coincides with a locationally-specific representation, but it must always be worth asking which came first. The more general question remains, moreover, of how our knowledge of personification cults might affect our late-twentieth-century understanding of the Greek art and literature in which so many personifications appear. If we are aware, for instance, of the significance of the sanctuary at Rhamnous, do occurrences of the abstract *nemesis* in Attic literature take on more significance? Or if we know that Eirene would soon be in receipt of a large-scale state sacrifice, does the plot of Aristophanes’ *Peace* strike us as less ridiculous? And what of Burkert’s “profusion of robed female statues of an allegorical character” — does the thought that at least some represent real goddesses of cult not give them more than “dusty” interest? It seems more than likely that our superficial familiarity with personification as a mode of literary and artistic representation leads us to draw a much sharper distinction between the categories of abstract, personification and goddess than would have been felt by most ancient Greeks.

Looked at from a different angle, the same question brings us back to the “myth into *logos*” debate, and whether personification cults can be taken as evidence of an increasingly rationalising trend in Greek religion. A striking feature noted in this study is the degree to which personifications of a “rational” character appear in archaic literature. Our earliest allegorical narrative (Ate and the Litai) appears in the *Iliad*, and dozens of personifications are linked in meaningful relationships in the

⁸ See Veyne 1988 *passim*; Buxton 1994, 145-65 (with criticism of Veyne). Cf. Harrison (1995, 316-9): “In some areas of [Herodotus] religious belief... a degree of scepticism actually helps to maintain belief... we can suggest that a presumption of (at least a degree of) belief would be a healthier position, when approaching Herodotus and other Greek writers, than a presumption of scepticism.”

Theogony, where Order is mother of Justice and Peace, Night of Sleep and Dreams. Some of our characters demonstrate a “double identity”, as both *dramatis personae* of myth and allegorical figures, from their earliest appearances: Themis in the *Iliad* is at once a fully-personalised goddess and a facilitator of *themis*, just as Nemesis in the *Kypria* is both a shape-changing nymph and characterised by *nemesis*, while Hesiod’s Peitho adorns the first bride Pandora with no other gift but *peitho*. It is true that more complex forms of both compositional and interpretational allegory develop from the mid-fifth century on (Prodikos’ Choice of Herakles, the Heimarmene Painter’s amphoriskos) and an increasing interest in expressing the rational “meaning” of personifications can be seen in the attributes which they acquire during the Hellenistic period (the measuring-rod and bridle of the two Nemeseis of Smyrna). But this seems largely a question of a more explicit spelling-out of messages previously left implicit than a radically new development. Similarly with personification cults, although they may increase in number from the fourth century and into the Hellenistic period, we can see that the phenomenon has well-established precedents in the fifth and even sixth centuries BC.⁹

One might even question whether it is inherently more “logical” to worship personified abstractions rather than the traditional gods. The one thing which does distinguish a personification from an Olympian goddess is her relatively restricted sphere of influence — Hygieia presumably only has power to grant health, whereas a goddess like Athena has a whole range of gifts at her disposal. The appearance of new personification cults in the later fifth and fourth centuries which Humphreys notes, and of more “rationalising” cult titles for existing gods, may reflect a trend which can be seen in secular contexts for increasing specialisation, e.g. with the development of the class of professional orators. Might not the worship of a personification be seen as the equivalent to consulting a specialist in a particular field? In any case it would be of interest to have more information on the identity of those who took part in rituals for our figures, to see whether they appealed particularly to the more intellectually minded. The small amount of epigraphic evidence we have, especially from dedications, unfortunately does not allow us to identify many

⁹ On this lack of a clear distinction between fourth-century personification cults and their predecessors, cf. Parker 1996, 235-6.

individuals in connection with personification cults, and most remain no more than names.¹⁰ That no particular erudition attached to such cults, however, can possibly be inferred from the fact that they can be served by priestesses — rationality is, after all, hardly a quality usually associated with women in the ancient world.¹¹

As I said at the outset, my approach here has been something of a compromise, adopted in order to make an attempt at answering some general questions on personification cults as a class, but based on more than a cursory look at the evidence for half-a-dozen sample figures. Two possible directions for future investigation strike me as equally valid, the choice between the two depending to some extent on the amount of evidence available for any given case. (i) Detailed study of individual figures, bringing together the iconographic material already collected in *LIMC* with a study of the abstract term and literary references to its personification, alongside a proper evaluation of the evidence for cult, especially epigraphic, all in the context of the historical circumstances of the places where the cult appears. This is of course no light undertaking, but Thériault's study of Homonoia gives some idea of what can be achieved. (ii) The better integration of personifications into studies of local cult systems. This second approach has the advantage of perhaps allowing a more sophisticated consideration of the social circumstances in which individual cults arose, and conversely might shed light on what values were deemed particularly important in a particular society at any given time. Amy Smith's consideration of fifth- and fourth-century political personifications provides an excellent basis for such an approach to Athenian cults, while Nicolas Richer's examination of a group of Spartan cults is suggestive of ways in which such studies may shed light on broader issues of social history. Further

¹⁰ Dedications to Themis: by a woman in Thessaly, an *agoranomos* in Lindos, Sostratos and Megakles at Rhamnous. To Nemesis: by "the Rhamnousians in Lemnos" and by Hierokles son of Aristonoe at Rhamnous, by the priestess Artemisia and her husband at Mylasa. To Peitho: by three *agoranomoi* at Olynthos. To Hygieia: potsherd by Kallis, and by the state to Athena Hygieia, clothes and hair by women at Titane (Paus.). Cf. privately-financed sacrifices to Nemesis by Dikaiarchos at Rhamnous, and to Hygieia and Asklepios by the physicians at Athens.

¹¹ Themis: priestesses Alexis at Thespiiai, Philostrate and Kallisto at Rhamnous; an olephoros, two hersephorai and a priestess at Athens. Nemesis: priestesses Kallisto, Pheidostrate and Aristonoe at Rhamnous, Artemisia at Mylasa; a priest at Athens. Peitho: priestess Hegesipyle and a singer-priestess at Athens; priest Menippos at Mylasa.

work on personification cults should make these figures more intelligible still, but I hope the current study has gone some way towards elucidating why personifications of abstract ideas “should be held to possess divine power”:

*quarum omnium rerum quia vis erat tanta ut sine deo regi non posset,
ipsa res deorum nomen obtinuit.*

Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 2.23.61

PAGE/PAGES
EXCLUDED
UNDER
INSTRUCTION
FROM
UNIVERSITY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aellen, C. (1994) *À la Recherche de l'Ordre Cosmique: forme et fonction des personnifications dans la céramique italiate*, Zurich
- Ahl, F.M. (1986) "Statius' *Thebaid*: a reconsideration", *ANRW* 2.32.5, 2803-912
- Alcock, S.E. and Osborne, R. (1994) *Placing the Gods: sanctuaries and sacred space in Ancient Greece*, Oxford
- Aleshire, S.B. (1989) *The Athenian Asklepieion: the people, their dedications, and the inventories*, Amsterdam
- Aleshire, S.B. (1991) *Asklepios at Athens: epigraphic and prosopographic essays on the Athenian healing cults*, Amsterdam
- Aleshire, S.B. (1992) "The economics of dedication at the Athenian Asklepieion" in Linders, T. and Alroth, B. (eds.) *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World* (Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990, *Boreas* 21), Uppsala, 85-98
- Aleshire, S.B. (1994) "Towards a definition of 'state cult' for ancient Athens", in Hägg (ed.), 9-16
- Alexandri-Tzahou, O. (1986) s.v. "Demokratia", *LIMC* III, 372-4
- Alexandri-Tzahou, O. (1993) "Personifications of Democracy", in Ober, J. and Hedrick, C.W. (eds.) *The Birth of Democracy: an exhibition celebrating the 2500th anniversary of democracy*, Athens, 149-59
- Alexandri-Tzahou, O. (1994) "Πολιτικές προσωποποιήσεις", in Coulson et al. (eds.), 55-72
- Amelung, W. (1908) *Vatican Katalog*, Berlin
- Angiolillo, S. (1992) "Hestia, l'edificio F e l'altare dei 12 dei ad Atene", *Ostraka* 1.2: 171-6
- Arafat, K.W. (1990) *Classical Zeus: a study in art and literature*, Cambridge
- Arafat, K.W. (1995) "Pausanias and the temple of Hera at Olympia", *ABSA* 90: 461-73
- Arafat, K.W. (1996) *Pausanias' Greece: ancient artists and Roman rulers*, Cambridge
- Arafat, K.W. (1997) "The recalcitrant mass: Athenaeus and Pausanias", paper delivered at the conference *Athenaios and His World*, Exeter, 1st-5th September
- Ashmole, B. (1962) "Torch-Racing at Rhamnous", *AJA* 66: 233-4

Axtell, H.L. (1987 [1907]) *The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions*, Chicago, repr. New York

Badian, E. (1987) "The Peace of Callias", *JHS* 107: 1-39

Barber, R. (1990) "The Greeks and their sculpture: interrelations of function, style, and display", Craik, E.M. (ed.) *Owls to Athens: essays on classical subjects presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 245-59

Barker, D.G.N. (1989) *This is not Persuasion: a case study in literacy and its effects on personification in art*, diss. Chicago

Bazant, J. (1997) s.v. "Hypnos", *LIMC* VIII, 643-5

Bean, G.E. and Cook, J.M. (1952) "The Cnidia?", *ABSA* 47: 171-212

Beazley, J.D. (1947) "The Rosi Krater", *JHS* 67: 1-9

Bees, R. (1993) *Zur Datierung des Prometheus Desmotes*, Stuttgart

Bemmann, K. (1994) *Füllhörner in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 38, Archäologie, 51) Frankfurt

Bérard, C. (1974) *Anodoi: Essai sur l'imagerie des passages chthoniens*, (*Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana* XIII) Institut Suisse de Rome

Berranger, D. (1992) *Recherches sur l'Histoire et la Prosopographie de Paros à l'Époque Archaique* (*BCH Suppl.* 23), Clermont-Ferrand

Bertier, J. (1972) *Mnésithée et Diechès*, Leiden

Beschi, L. (1967-8) "Contributi di topografia ateniese", *ASAA* n.s. 29-30: 511-36

Beschi, L. (1982) "Il rilievo di Telemachos ricompletato", *AAA* 15: 31-43

Bieber, M. (1915) *Die antiken Skulpturen und Bronzen des Königl. Museum Fridericianum in Cassel*, Marburg

Bieber, M. (1977) *Ancient Copies: Contributions to the History of Greek and Roman Art*, New York

Biers, W.R. (1992) *Art, Artefacts and Chronology in Classical Archaeology*, London and New York

Blech, M. (1982) *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin

- Blondé, F., Perrault, J. and Péristeri, C. (1992) "Un atelier de potier archaïque à Phari (Thasos), in Blondé, F. and Perreault, J.Y. (eds.) *Les Ateliers de Potiers dans le Monde Grec aux Époques Géométriques, Archaïque et Classique* (BCH Suppl. 23), 11-40
- Bloomfield, M.W. (1963) "A Grammatical Approach to Personification Allegory", *Modern Philology* 60: 161-71
- Blümel, C. (1950/1) "Der Fries des Tempels Nike in der attischen Kunst des fünften Jahrhunderts vor Christus", *JDAI* 65/6: 135-65
- Blundell, S. (1995) *Women in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge Mass.
- Boersma, J.S. (1970) *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 BC*, Groningen
- Boulogne, J. (1994) *Plutarque: un aristocrate grec sous l'occupation romaine*, Lille
- Bothmer, D. von (1981) "The death of Sarpedon", in Hyatt, S.L. (ed.) *The Greek Vase*, New York
- Bowie, A.M. (1993) *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy*, Cambridge
- Bowra, C.M. (1964) *Pindar*, Oxford
- Bremer, J.M. (1981) "Greek Hymns" in Versnel (ed.) 193-215
- Bremmer, J.N. (ed. 1987) *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London
- Bremmer, J.N. (1990) s.v. "Hermann Usener", in Briggs, W.W. and Calder, W.M. (eds.) *Classical Scholarship. A Biographical Encyclopedia*, New York and London, 462-78
- Bremmer, J.N. (1994) *Greek Religion (Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics No. 24)*, Oxford
- Brewster, H. (1997) *The River Gods of Greece: myths and mountain waters in the Hellenic world*, London
- Brinkmann, V. (1985) "Die aufgemalten Namensbeischriften am Nord- und Ostfries des Siphnierschatzhauses", *BCH* 109: 77-130
- Bruchmann, C.F.H. (1893) *Epitheta Deorum* (= Roscher Suppl. 1), Leipzig
- Bruit Zaidman, L. and Schmitt Pantel, P. (1992) *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*, tr. Cartledge, P., Cambridge
- Buck, C.D. (1933) *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, Chicago
- Burgess, J.F. (1972) "Statius' Altar of Mercy", *CQ* n.s. 22: 339-49

- Burkert, W. (1985a [1977]) *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, tr. Raffan, J., Oxford
- Burkert, W. (1985b) "Opferritual bei Sophokles. Pragmatik - Symbolik - Theater", *AU* 28.2: 5-20
- Burkert, W. (1987) *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge Mass. and London
- Burn, L. (1987) *The Meidias Painter*, Oxford
- Burton, D.H. (1996) *The Search for Immortality in Archaic Greek Myth*, diss. London
- Buxton, R.G.A. (1982) *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy: A Study of Peitho*, Cambridge
- Buxton, R.G.A. (1994) *Imaginary Greece*, Cambridge
- Buxton, R.G.A. (ed. forthcoming) *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*, Oxford
- Cairns, D.L. (1993) *Aidôs*, Oxford
- Cairns, D.L. (1996a) "Hybris, dishonour, and thinking big", *JHS* 116: 1-32
- Cairns, D.L. (1996b) "Veiling, αἰδώς and a red-figure amphora by Phintias", *JHS* 116: 152-8
- Camp, J.M. (ed. 1990) *The Athenian Agora: a guide to the excavation and museum*, 4th ed. revised, Athens
- Camp, J.M. (1992) *The Athenian Agora*, 2nd ed. London
- Carpenter, T.H. (1991) *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece*, London
- Caskey, L.D. and Beazley, J.D. (1954) *Attic Vase Painting in the Museum of Fine Arts*, Boston
- Cawkwell, G.L. (1963) "Notes on the Peace of 375/4", *Historia* 12: 84-95
- Chappell, M. (1991) "Apostrophe in Homer and Pindar", unpublished paper, Institute of Classical Studies, London
- Chappell, M. (1994) "Delphi and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*", unpublished paper, Institute of Classical Studies, London
- Christiansen, J. and Melander, T. (eds. 1988) *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery, Copenhagen, August 31-September 4 1987*, Copenhagen

- Chrysostomou, P. (1994) “Εν(ν)οδία, Ενοδία Εκάτη, Εκάτη Ενοδία”, in *ΘΕΣΣΑΛΙΑ· Δεκαπέντε χρόνια αρχαιολογικής έρευνας 1975-1990. Αποτελέσματα και προόψεις*, Athens, 339-46
- Clinton, K. (1992) *Myth and Cult: the iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Martin P. Nilsson Lectures on Greek Religion, 1990, Swedish Institute at Athens), Stockholm
- Clinton, K. (1994a) s.v. “Ploutos”, in *LIMC* VII, 416-20
- Clinton, K. (1994b) “The Epidauria and the arrival of Asclepius in Athens”, in Hägg (ed.), 17-34
- Cohen, A. (1997) *The Alexander Mosaic: stories of victory and defeat*, Cambridge
- Cole, S.G. (1992) “Gynaiki ou themis: gender difference in the Greek *leges sacrae*”, *Helios* 19.1-2, 104-22
- Collard, C. Cropp, M.J. and Lee, K.H. (1995) *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays* I, Warminster
- Connelly, J.B. (1996) “Parthenon and *Parthenoi*: a mythological interpretation of the Parthenon frieze”, *AJA* 100: 53-80
- Constantinidou, S. (1988) “Evidence for marriage ritual in *Iliad* iii”, *Dodona*, 1990.2, 47-59
- Corsano, M. (1988) *Themis: la noma e l’oracolo nella Grecia antica*, Lecce
- Coste-Messelière, P. de la, and Flacelière, R. (1930) “Une statue de la Terre à Delphes”, *BCH* 54: 283-95
- Coulson, W.D.E., Palagia, O., Shear Jr., T.L., Shapiro, H.A. and Frost, F.J. (eds. 1994) *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, Oxford
- Courby, F. (1927) *Fouilles de Delphes* II.2: *La Terrasse du Temple*, Paris
- Creaghan, J.S., S.J., and Raubitschek, A.E. (1947) “Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens”, *Hesperia* 16: 1-52
- Croissant, F. (1990) s.v. “Hygieia”, in *LIMC* V, 554-572
- Crosby, M. (1949) “The Altar of the Twelve Gods in Athens”, *Hesperia* Suppl. 8: 82-103
- Crotty, K. (1994) *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey*, Cornell
- Curtius, E.R. (1979 [1948]) *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, London

- Defradas, J. (1958) review of Vos 1956, *REA* 60: 203-6
- Despinis, G.I. (1971) *Συμβολήν στη μελέτη του Αγορακρίτου*, Athens
- Detienne, M. (1989) *Dionysos at Large*, London
- Deubner, L. (1902-9) "Personifikationen abstrakter Begriffe", in Roscher III, 2068-169
- Dietrich, B.C. (1967) *Death, Fate and the Gods*, London
- Dietrich, B.C. (1988) "Divine personality and personification", *Kernos* 1: 19-28
- Dijk, J.J.A. van (1953) *La Sagesse Suméro-Accadienne*, Leiden 1953
- Dinsmoor, W.B. (1961) "Rhamnountine fantasies", *Hesperia* 30: 179-204
- Dinsmoor, W.B. (1973 [1902]) *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, 4th ed. London
- Dörrie, H. (1983) "Göttervorstellung", *RAC* 12: 82-154
- Donohue, A.A. (1988) *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture*, Atlanta
- Dover, K. (ed. 1980) *Plato: Symposium*, Cambridge
- Dowden, K. (1992) *The Uses of Greek Mythology*, London and New York
- Duchemin, J. (ed. 1980) *Mythe et Personnification: travaux et mémoires (Actes du colloque du Grand Palais, Paris, 7-8 Mai 1977)*, Paris
- Duchemin, J. (1980) "Personnifications d'abstractions et d'éléments naturels: Hésiode et l'Orient", in Duchemin (ed.), 1-15
- Dumézil, G. (1949) *L'Héritage Indo-Européen à Rome*, Paris
- Dyson, M. (1994) "Prometheus and the wedge: text and staging at Aeschylus, *PV* 54-81", *JHS* 114: 154-6
- Easterling, P.E. and Muir, J.V. (1985) *Greek Religion and Society*, Cambridge
- Eckstein, F. (1981) s.v. "Aidos", *LIMC* I, 351-3
- Edelstein, E.J. and L. (1975 [1945]) *Asclepius: a Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*, Baltimore, repr. New York
- Ehrenberg, V. (1921) *Die Rechtsidee im frühen Griechentum*, Leipzig
- Edwards, C.M. (1990) "Tyche at Corinth", *Hesperia* 59: 529-42

- Elsner, J. (1991) "Cult and sculpture: sacrifice in the Ara Pacis Augustae", *JRS* 89: 50-61
- Elsner, J. (1992) "Pausanias: a Greek pilgrim in the Roman World", *Past and Present* 135: 3-29
- Erim, K.T. (1979) "The Zoilos frieze", in Alföldi, A. (ed.) *Aion in Mérida und Aphrodisias*, Berlin, 35-7
- Farnell, L.R. (1896-1909) *Cults of the Greek States* (5 vols), London
- Farnell, L.R. (1907) "The place of the 'Sonder-Götter' in Greek polytheism", in *Anthropological essays presented to Edward Burnett Tylor*, Oxford, 81-100
- Farnell, L.R. (1912) *The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion* (Hibbert Lectures), London
- Farnell, L.R. (1930) *The Works of Pindar* (3 vols.), London
- Fehling, D. (1989 [1971]) *Herodotus and his "Sources": citation, invention and narrative art*, Leeds
- Ferguson, J. (1970) *The Religions of the Roman Empire*, London
- Fisher, N.R.E. (1992) *Hybris: a study in the values of honour and shame in Ancient Greece*, Warminster
- Fisher, N.R.E. (1992) "Sparta re(de)valued: some Athenian public attitudes to Sparta between Leuctra and the Lamian War", in Powell, A. and Hodkinson, S. (eds.) *The Shadow of Sparta*, London
- Fodor, I. (1959) "The Origin of Grammatical Gender", *Lingua* 8: 1-41, 186-214
- Foucart, P. (1889) "Inscriptions de l'Acropole", *BCH* 13: 156-78
- Fox, M. (1998) "The constrained man", in Foxhall and Salmon (eds.), 6-22
- Foxhall, L. (1993) "Farming and fighting in ancient Greece", in Rich, J. and Shipley, G. (eds.) *War and Society in the Greek World*, London and New York, 134-45
- Foxhall, L. (1995) "Women's ritual and men's work in ancient Athens", in Hawley, R. and Levick, B. (eds.) *Women in antiquity: new assessments*, London and New York, 97-110
- Foxhall, L. (1997) "A view from the top: evaluating the Solonian property classes", in Mitchell and Rhodes (eds.), 113-35
- Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. (eds. 1998) *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*, London

- Francis, E.D. and Vickers, M. (1981) "Leagros Kalos", *PCPS* 207, n.s. 27: 96-136
- Francis, E.D. and Vickers, M. (1988) "The Agora Revisited: Athenian Chronology c.500-450 BC", *ABSA* 83: 143-67
- Frantz, A. (1988) *The Athenian Agora XXIV, Late Antiquity: AD 267-700*, Princeton
- Frazer, J.G. (1898) *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, London
- Froning, H. (1981) *Marmor-Schmuckreliefs mit griechischen Mythen im 1. Jh. v. Chr.*, Mainz
- Frye, N. (1957) *Anatomy of Criticism*, Princeton
- Furley, W.D. (1995) "Praise and persuasion in Greek Hymns", *JHS* 115: 29-46
- Gadbery, L.M. (1992) "The Sanctuary of the Twelve Gods in the Athenian Agora: a Revised View", *Hesperia* 61: 447-89
- Gallet de Santerre, H. (1958) *Délos Primitive et Archaique*, Paris
- Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek Myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources*, Baltimore
- Garland, R. (1992) *Introducing New Gods: the politics of Athenian religion*, London
- Garland, R. (1994) *Religion and the Greeks*, Bristol
- Gaster, T.H. (1950) *Thespis: ritual, myth and drama in the ancient Near East*, New York
- Ghali-Kahil, L.B. (1955) *Les Enlèvements et le Retour d'Hélène dans les textes et les documents figurés*, Paris
- Gill, D.W.J. (1988) "The distribution of Greek vases and long distance trade", in Christiansen and Melander (eds.), 175-85
- Godolphin, F.R.B. (1931) "The Nemesis of Cratinus", *CPh* 26: 423-6
- Götze, G. (1938) "Die attischen Dreifigurenreliefs", *MDAI(R)* 53: 189-280
- Gombrich, E.H. (1971) "Personification", in Bolgar, R.R. (ed.) *Classical Influences on European Culture AD 500-1500*, Cambridge, 247-57
- Gomme, A.W. and Sandbach, F.H. (1973) *Menander, a Commentary*, Oxford
- Grace, V. (1946) "Early Thasian stamped amphoras", *AJA* 50: 31-8
- Graef, B. and Langlotz, E. (1933) *Die Antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen II*, Berlin

- Grandjean, Y. (1992) “Établissement d’une typologie des amphores Thasiennes”, *BCH* 116: 541-84
- Green, R.M. (1951) *A Translation of Galen’s Hygiene*, Illinois
- Griffith, M. (1977) *The authenticity of the ‘Prometheus Bound’*, Cambridge
- Gross, N.P. (1985) *Amatory Persuasion in Antiquity: studies in theory and practice*, London and Toronto
- Habicht, C. (1985) *Pausanias’ Guide to Ancient Greece*, Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Habicht, C. (1996) ‘Divine honours for King Antigonos Gonatas in Athens’, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 15:131-4
- Habicht, C. (1997 [1995]) *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, tr. Schneider, D.L., Cambridge, Mass.
- Hägg, R. (ed. 1994) *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Swedish Institute at Athens), Stockholm
- Halperin, D.M. (1990) *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*, London and New York
- Hamdorf, W.F. (1964) *Griechische Kultpersonifikationen der vorhellenistischen Zeit*, Mainz
- Hamilton, R. (1992) *Choes and Anthesteria: Athenian iconography and ritual*, Ann Arbor
- Hammond, N.G.L. (1992) “Plataea’s Relations with Thebes, Sparta and Athens”, *JHS* 112: 143-50
- Hani, J. (1980) “Aidos personnifiée et sa portée réelle chez les Grecs”, in Duchemin (ed.) 103-12
- Hankinson, R.J. (1991) *Galen on the Therapeutic Method Books I and II*, Oxford
- Harrison, E.B. (1964) “Hesperides and Heroes: a Note on the Three-figure Reliefs”, *Hesperia* 33: 76-82
- Harrison, E.B. (1977) “The shoulder-cord of Themis”, in Höckmann, U. and Krug, A. (eds.) *Festschrift für Frank Brommer*, Mainz, 155-61
- Harrison, J.E. (1903) *Prolegomena to the study of Greek religion*, Cambridge
- Harrison, J.E. (1927) *Themis: a study of the social origins of Greek religion*, Cambridge

- Harrison, T.E.H. (1995) *Herodotus and the Divine*, diss. Oxford
- Hastings, J. (ed. 1917) *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* IX, New York, s.v. "Personification", 781-803
- Hausmann, U. (1948) *Kunst und Heilum: Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Asklepiosreliefs*, Potsdam
- Hausmann, U. (1966) review of Hamdorf 1964, *Gnomon* 38: 705-9
- Hermay, A., Cassimatis, H. and Vollkommer, R. (1986), s.v. "Eros", *LIMC* III, 850-942
- Herter, H. (1935) s.v. "Nemesis", *RE* XVI.2, 2338-80
- Hibbs, V.A. (1962) *Personification of Abstract Concepts in Greek Painting*, MA diss. New York
- Hinks, R. (1939) *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art*, London
- Hirzel, R. (1907) *Themis, Dike und Verwandtes: Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rechtsidee bei den Griechen*, Leipzig
- Hodge, A.T. and Tomlinson, R.A. (1969) "Some notes on the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous", *AJA* 73 (1969)
- Hollis, A.S. (1992) "Attica in Hellenistic Poetry", *ZPE* 93: 1-15
- Holzberg, N. (1974) *Menander: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik*, Nürnberg
- Hoff, M. (1989) "The early history of the Roman Agora at Athens", in Walker, S. and Cameron, A. (eds.) *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* (BICS Suppl. 55), London, 1-8
- Hopwood, K.R. (1986) "Peace in the Ancient World", in Pauling, L., Laszlo, E. and Yoo, J.Y. (eds.) *World Encyclopedia of Peace*, Oxford, New York, etc., vol. II 197-208
- Humphreys, S.C. (1985) "Lycurgus of Butadae: an Athenian aristocrat", in Eadie, J.W. and Ober, J. (eds.) *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: essays in honour of Chester G. Starr*, Lanham, 199-236
- Humphreys, S.C. (1986) "Dynamics of the Greek breakthrough: the dialogue between philosophy and religion", in Eisenstadt, S.N. (ed.) *The Origins and Diversity of Axial Age Civilisations*, New York
- Hunter, R.L. (1983) *Eubulus, the Fragments*, Cambridge
- Hunter, R.L. (1985) *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, Cambridge

- Ibrahim, M.H. (1973) *Grammatical Gender: its origin and development*, The Hague
- Icard-Gianolio, N. (1994) s.v. "Peitho", *LIMC* VII, 242-50
- Isager, J. (1991) *Pliny on Art and Society: the Elder Pliny's chapters on the history of art*, London
- Jameson, M.H., Jordan, D.R. and Kotansky, R.D. (1993) *A 'lex sacra' from Selinous (GRBS Monographs 11)*, Durham, North Carolina
- Jameson, M.H. (1994) "*Theoxenia*", in Hägg (ed.), 35-57
- Janko, R. (1992) *The Iliad: a commentary, vol. IV: books 13-16*, Cambridge
- Jeffery, L.H. (1990) *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (rev. ed.), Oxford
- Jenkins, I. (1983) "Is there life after marriage? A study of the abduction motif in vase paintings of the Athenian wedding ceremony", *BICS* 30: 137-45
- Jesnik, I.J. (1992) *The Image of Orpheus in Roman Mosaics*, diss. London
- Jouan, F. (1980) "Harmonia", in Duchemin (ed.), 113-21
- Judeich, W. (1931) *Topographie von Athen*, 2nd ed. Munich
- Jung, H. (1976) "Zur Eirene des Kephisodot", *JDAI* 91: 97-134
- Kahn, C.H. (1979) *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus*, Cambridge
- Karanastassi, P., Rausa, F. and Vollkommer, R. (1992) s.v. "Nemesis", *LIMC* VI, 733-73
- Karanastassi, P. (1997) s.v. "Themis", *LIMC* VIII, 1199-1205
- Kearns, E. (1994) "Cakes in Greek sacrifice regulations", in Hägg (ed.), 65-70
- Kerényi, C. (1959) *Asklepios: archetypal image of the physician's existence*, New York
- Kershaw, S.P. (1986) *Personification in the Hellenistic World: Tyche, Kairos, Nemesis*, diss. Bristol
- Key, M. R. (1975) *Male/Female Language*, New Jersey
- Klose, D.O.A. (1987) *Die Münzprägung von Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Berlin
- Komornicka, A.M. (1964) *Métaphores, personnifications et comparaisons dans l'œuvre d'Aristophane*, Wrocław

- Konstantinopoulos, G. (1977) *Musées de Rhodes I: Musée Archéologique*, Paris
- Kraay, C.M. and Hirmer, M. (1966) *Greek Coins*, London
- Krug, A. (1993) *Heilkunst und Heilkult: Medizin in der Antike*, Munich
- La Rocca, E. (1974) "Eirene e Ploutos", *JdI* 89: 112-36
- Lada-Richards, I. (1996) "Comic descent, comic ascent, and mystic initiation: Dionysos in theatre and ritual", unpublished paper, Classical Association AGM, Nottingham
- Lapp, F. (1960) *De Callimachi Cyrenaei Tropis et Figuris*, diss. Bonn
- Laroche, E. (1949) *Histoire de la Racine NEM- en Grec Ancien*, Paris
- Latte, K. (1934) s.v. "Themis", *RE*² V.2, 1626-30
- Latte, K. (1960) *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Munich
- Laurens, A.-F. (1988) s.v. "Hebe I", *LIMC* IV, 458-64
- Lausberg, H. (1990) *Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik*, 3rd ed. Stuttgart
- Lawton, C. L. (1995) *Attic Document Reliefs: art and politics in ancient Athens*, Oxford
- Lazzeroni, R. (1993) "Il genere Indoeuropeo: una categoria naturale?", in Bettini, M. (ed.) *Maschile/Femminile: genere e ruoli nelle culture antiche*, Rome/Bari, 3-16
- Lévêque, P. (1959) *Aurea Catena Homeri: une étude sur l'allégorie grecque*, Paris
- Levi, P. (tr. 1979) *Pausanias: Guide to Greece*, Harmondsworth
- Levick, B.M. (1975) "Mercy and Moderation on the Coinage of Tiberius", in Levick, B.M. (ed.) *The Ancient Historian and his Materials: Essays in Honour of C.E. Stevens on his seventieth birthday*, 123-37
- Lewis, C.S. (1936) *Allegory of Love*, Oxford
- Lind, L.R. (1973-4) "Roman Religion and Ethical Thought: abstraction and personification", *CJ* 69: 108-19
- Lind, L.R. (1976) "Primitivity and Roman Ideas: the survivals", *Latomus* 35: 245-68
- Litchfield, H.W. (1914) "National Exempla Virtutis in Roman Literature", *HSCP* 25: 1-71
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1971) *The Justice of Zeus*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London

- Loeb, E.H. (1990) s.v. "Hybris I", *LIMC* V, 551-3
- Long, A.P. (1992) *In a Chariot Drawn by Lions: the Search for the Female in Deity*, London
- Long, C.R. (1987) *The Twelve Gods of Greece and Rome*, Leiden
- Loraux, N. (1992) "What is a goddess?", in P. Schmitt Pantel (ed.), *A History of Women in the West*, Cambridge Mass., I.11-44
- Loraux, N. (1995) *The Experiences of Tiresias: the feminine and the Greek man*, tr. Wissing, P., Princeton
- Lowe, N.J. (1983) *Problems of Fertility Religion in Classical Attica*, diss. Cambridge
- Lowe, N.J. (1998) "Thesmophoria and Haloa: Myth, Physics, and Mysteries", in Blundell, S. and Williamson, M. (eds.), *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*, London and New York, 149-73
- Lowe, N.J. (forthcoming) "Revisions, revivals, and duplicate titles in Aristophanes", *JHS*
- Maaß, M. (1972) *Die Prohedrie des Dionysostheaters in Athen*, Munich
- MacDowell, D.M. (1995) *Aristophanes and Athens*, Oxford
- Marinatos, N. and Hägg, R. (eds. 1993) *Greek Sanctuaries: new approaches*, London
- Mark, I.S. (1979) *Nike and the Cult of Athena Nike on the Athenian Akropolis*, diss. New York
- Mark, I.S. (1993) *The Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: architectural stages and chronology*, Princeton
- Marshall, E. (1997) "Ideology and reception: reading symbols of Roman Cyrene", in Parkins, H.M. (ed.) *Roman Urbanism: beyond the consumer city*, London and New York, 173-209
- Martin, L.H. (1987) *Hellenistic Religions: an introduction*, Oxford
- Matheson, S.B. (ed. 1994) *An Obsession with Fortune: Tyche in Greek and Roman art* (*Yale University Art Gallery Bulletin* 1994), Princeton
- Mathiopoulos, E. (1968) *Zur Typologie der Göttin Athena im V. Jahrh. v. Chr.*, diss.
- Maurizio, L. (1995) "Anthropology and spirit possession: a reconsideration of the Pythia's role at Delphi", *JHS* 115: 69-86

- Maxmin, J. (1974) “*Euphronios epoiesen*: portrait of the artist as a presbyopic potter”, *G&R* 21: 178-80
- Meillet, A. (1921) “Le genre grammatical” , *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale* I, Paris, 199-229
- Meillet, A. (1938) “Le genre féminin”, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale* II, Paris, 24-8
- Melville, A.D. and Vessey, D.W.T. (1992) *Statius' Thebaid*, Oxford
- Metzger, H. (1944) “L’ôn de la collection Stathatos”, *Monuments Piot* 40: 69-86
- Mikalson, J.D. (1983) *Athenian Popular Religion*, London
- Miles, M.M. (1989) “A reconstruction of the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous”, *Hesperia* 58: 131-249
- Miller, S.G. (1974) “The altar of the six goddesses in Thessalian Pherai”, *CSCA* 7: 231-56
- Mitchell, F.W. (1970) *Lykourgan Athens: 338-322 (Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple, 2nd series)*, Cincinnati
- Mitchell, L. and Rhodes, P.J. (eds. 1997) *The Development of the Archaic Polis*, London and New York
- Mitropolou, E. (1975) *A New Interpretation of the Telemachos Monument*, Athens
- Mitropolou, E. (1977) *Corpus I. Attic Votive Reliefs of the sixth and fifth centuries BC*, Athens
- Monceaux, P. (1883) “Inscriptions de Thessalie”, *BCH* 7: 41-61
- Moretti, L. (1967) *Iscrizioni Storiche Ellenistiche*, vol. I, Florence
- Morgan, C. (1990) *Athletes and Oracles: the transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the eighth century BC*, Cambridge
- Morgan, C. (1993) “The origins of pan-Hellenism”, in Marinatos and Hägg (eds.), 18-44
- Morgan, C. (1997) “The archaeology of sanctuaries in early Iron Age and Archaic *ethne*”, in Mitchell and Rhodes (eds.), 168-98
- Mossman, J. (ed. 1997) *Plutarch and His Intellectual World*, London
- Mossman, J. (forthcoming) “Is the pen mightier than the sword? The failure of rhetoric in Plutarch’s *Demosthenes*”, *Histos*

- Most, G. (1987) "Alcman's 'Cosmogonic' Fragment", *CQ* 37: 1-19
- Muir, J. (1985) "Religion and the new education: the challenge of the Sophists", in Easterling and Muir (eds.)
- Murray, O. (1993) *Early Greece*, 2nd ed. London
- Myerowitz, M. (1992) "The Domestication of Desire: Ovid's *Parva Tabella* and the Theater of Love", in Richlin, A. (ed.) Oxford, 131-57
- Neils, J. (ed. 1992) *Goddess and Polis: the Panathenaic festival in ancient Athens*, Princeton
- Neils, J. (1992) "Panathenaic amphoras: their meaning, makers, and markets", in Neils (ed.), 29-51
- Neuser, K. (1982) *Anemoi: Studien zur Darstellung der Winde und Windgottheiten in der Antike*, Rome
- Nilsson, M.P. (1952) "Kultische Personifikationen", *Eranos* 50: 31-40
- Nilsson, M.P. (1967 [1950]) *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* II, 3rd ed. Munich
- Nilsson, M.P. (1968) *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*, 2nd ed. Lund
- Noe, S.P. (1984) *The Coinage of Metapontum*, New York
- Nünlist, R. (1993) "Szenen aus Menanders *Dis Exapaton*?", *ZPE* 99: 245-78
- Oakley, J.H. and Sinos, R.H. (1993) *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*, Wisconsin
- Oakley, J.H. (1995) "Nuptial nuances: wedding images in non-wedding scenes of myth", in Reeder, E.D. (ed.) *Pandora: women in Classical Greece*, Baltimore, 63-73
- Ober, J. (1995) "Greek *horoi*: artifactual texts and the contingency of meaning", in Small, D.B. (ed.) *Methods in the Mediterranean (Mnemosyne Suppl. 5)*, 91-123
- Oikonomides, A.N. (1964) *The Two Agoras in Ancient Athens*, Chicago
- Oliver, G.J. (1998) "I am the *horos*: boundaries and space in the Athenian *polis*", University of Wales Classics Colloquium, Gregynog, 1st-2nd June
- Oliver, J.H. (1960) *Demokratia, the Gods, and the Free World*, Baltimore
- Osborne, C. (1994) *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the god of love*, Oxford
- Osborne, R. (1985) "The Erection and Mutilation of the Hermai", *PCPhS* 211, n.s. 31: 47- 73

- Osborne, R. (1987) *Classical Landscape With Figures: the ancient Greek city and its countryside*, London
- Ostrowski, J.A. (1990) *Les Personnifications des Provinces dans l'Art Romain*, Warsaw
- Ostrowski, J.A. (1991) *Personifications of Rivers in Greek and Roman Art*, Warsaw
- Padel, R. (1992) *In and Out of the Mind: Greek Images of the Tragic Self*, Princeton
- Palagia, O. (1982) "A Colossal Statue of a Personification from the Agora of Athens", *Hesperia* 51: 99-113
- Palagia, O. (1994) "No Demokratia", in Coulson et al. (eds.), Oxford 113-22
- Palagia, O. and Lewis, D.M. (1989) "The ephebes of Erechtheis, 333/2 BC and their dedication", *BSA* 84: 333-44
- Papachatzze, N.D. (1974) *Πανσανίου Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις*, Athens
- Papadaki-Angelidou, V. (1960) Αἱ Προσωποποιήσεις εἰς τὴν Αρχαίαν Ελληνικὴν Τέχην, diss. Athens
- Papapostolou, I.A. (1989) "Monuments des combats de gladiateurs à Patras", *BCH* 113: 351-401
- Parke, H.W. (1977) *Festivals of the Athenians*, New York
- Parker, R. (1983) *Miasma*, Oxford
- Parker, R. (1985) "Greek oracles and Greek states", in Cartledge, P.A. and Harvey, F.D. (eds.) *Crux: Essays Presented to G.E.M. de Ste. Croix on his 75th Birthday*, Sidmouth, 298-326
- Parker (1987) "Festivals of the Attic demes" in Linders, T. and Nordquist, S. *Gifts for the gods* (Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985, *Boreas* 15), Uppsala, 136-47
- Parker, R. (1989) "Spartan religion", in Powell, A. (ed.) *Classical Sparta: Techniques Behind her Success*, London and New York
- Parker, R. (1991) "The *Hymn to Demeter* and the *Homeric Hymns*", *G&R* 38: 1-17
- Parker, R. (1996) *Athenian Religion: a History*, Oxford
- Parker, R. (1998) "Theophoric names and the history of Greek religion", unpublished paper, British Academy, 12th July
- Peek, W. (1934) "Griechische Inschriften", *AM* 59: 35-80

- Peek, W. (1968-75) *Lexikon zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos*, Berlin
- Petrakos, V.C. (1984) Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος, *Praktika* [1982]: 127-162
- Petrakos, V.C. (1986) Προβλήματα της βάσης του αγάλματος της Νεμέσεως, *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik* 2: 89-107
- Petrakos, V.C. (1987) Οι ανασκαφές του Ραμνούντος (1813-1987), *AEphem*: 265-98
- Petrakos, V.C. (1988) Ανασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος, *Praktika* [1984]: 146-209
- Petrakos, V.C. (1991) *Rhamnous*, Athens
- Petrakos, V.C. (1992) Ανασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος, *Praktika* [1989]: 1-37
- Piatkowski, A. (1960) “Personificari si Abstractii la Alcmana”, *An. Univ. Bucuresti, Ser. Stiint Soc.*, 18: 319-24
- Picard, C. (1942) “Le théâtre grec et l’allégorie”, *REG* 55: 25-49
- Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. (1946) *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*, Oxford
- Pighius, S. (1568) *Themis Dea, seu De Lege Divina*, Antwerp (Plantin)
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. (1988) “Épithètes cultuelles et interprétation philosophique. À propos d’Aphrodite Ourania et Pandémos à Athènes”, *L’Antiquité Classique* 57: 142-57
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. (1991) “Le culte de la Persuasion. Peithô en Grèce ancienne”, *RHR* 208: 395-413
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. (1994) *L’Aphrodite Grecque. Contribution à l’étude de ses cultes et de sa personnalité dans le panthéon archaïque et classique* (= *Kernos Suppl.* 4), Liège
- Pötscher, W. (1972) s.v. “Personifikation”, *Der Kleine Pauly* IV, 661-3
- Polignac, F. de (1984) *La Naissance de la Cité Grecque. Cultes, espace et société, VIII^e- VII^e siècles avant J.-C.*, Paris
- Pollitt, J.J. (1974) *The ancient view of Greek art: criticism, history and terminology*, New Haven: Yale University Press
- Pollitt, J.J. (1986) *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge
- Pollitt, J.J. (1990) *The Art of Ancient Greece: Sources and Documents*, Cambridge

- Pomeroy, S.B. (ed. 1998) *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and Consolation to his Wife: translation, commentary and interpretative essays*, New York
- Pottier, M.E. (1889-90) "Les Représentations Allégoriques dans les Peintures de Vases Grecs", *Monuments Grecs* 17-18: 15-19
- Pouilloux, J. (1954) *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos I: de la fondation de la cité à 196 avant J.-C. (Etudes Thasiennes III)*, Paris
- Pouilloux, J. (1954) *La Forteresse de Rhamnonte*, Paris
- Price, T. Hadzisteliou (1971) "Double and Multiple Representations in Greek Art and Religious Thought", *JHS* 91: 48-69
- Price, T. Hadzisteliou (1978) *Kourotrophos. Cults and Representations of the Greek Nursing Deities*, Leiden
- Pritchett, W. K. (1979) *The Greek State at War III: Religion*, Berkeley
- Pulley, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek Religion*, Oxford
- Radt, S.L. (1958) *Pindars Zweiter und Sechster Paian*, Amsterdam
- Rasmussen, T. and Spivey, N. (1991) *Looking at Greek Vases*, Cambridge
- Redfield, J.M. (1975) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: the tragedy of Hector*, Chicago and London
- Reinhardt, K. (1966 [1960]) "Personifikation und Allegorie", *Vermächtnis der Antike: gesammelte Essays zur Philosophie und Geschichtsschreibung*, 2nd ed. Göttingen
- Richer, N. (forthcoming), "Innovations at Sparta in the archaic period: *pathemata* and their evolution", in Powell, A. and Hodkinson, S. (eds.) *Sparta: New Perspectives* (= proceedings of the conference held at Hay-on-Wye, 8-10th September 1997), University of Wales Press
- Richlin, A. (ed. 1992), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, Oxford
- Ridgway, B.S. (1984) *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: the problem of the originals*, Ann Arbor
- Ridgway, B.S. (1996) "Images of Athena on the Akropolis", in Neils (ed.), 119-142
- Ripa, C. (1603 [1593]) *Iconologia*, 2nd ed. Rome
- Robert, L. (1977) "Une fête de la Paix à Athènes au IV^e siècle", *AEphem*: 211-16
- Roberts, L. (1975) "The unutterable symbols of (Γῆ)-Θέμις", *HThR* 68: 73-82

- Robertson, N. (1996) "Athena's shrines and festivals", in Neils (ed.), *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon*, Wisconsin, 27-77
- Robins, R.H. (1951) *Ancient and Medieval Grammatical Theory in Europe*, London
- Robinson, D.M. (1933) "A new Greek inscription from Macedonia", *AJA* 37: 602-4
- Rodgers, R. (1995) "Women underfoot in life and art: female representations in fourth-century Romano-British mosaics", *Journal of European Archaeology*, 3.1: 177-87
- Rodgers, R. (forthcoming) *Imagery and Ideology: female representation in Roman art, with special reference to Britain and Gaul*, diss. Durham
- Roller, L.E. (1988) "Foreign Cults in Greek Vase Painting", in Christiansen and Melander (eds.), 506-15
- Romano, I.B. (1988) "Early Greek cult images and cult practices", in Hägg, R., Marinatos, N. and Nordquist, G.C. (eds.) *Early Greek Cult Practice*, Stockholm, 127-34
- Rosivach, V.J. (1994) *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-Century Athens* (American Classical Studies 34), Atlanta
- Roßbach, O. (1897-1902) s.v. "Nemesis", in Roscher III.1, 117-66
- Rubensohn, O. (1949) s.v. "Paros", in *RE* XVIII.4, Stuttgart, 1781-1872
- Russell, D. (1997) "Plutarch, *Amatorius* 13-18", in Mossman (ed.), 99-111
- Sarian, H. (1990) s.v. "Hestia", *LIMC* V, 407-12
- Schachter, A. (1986-94) *Cults of Boiotia (BICS Supp. 38, 3 vols.)*, London
- Schauenburg, K. (1953) "Pluton und Dionysos", *JDAI* 68: 38-72
- Schefold, K. (1981) *Die Göttersage in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst*, Munich
- Schefold, K. (1992 [1978]) *Gods and Heroes in Late Archaic Greek Art*, tr. Griffiths, A.H., Cambridge
- Schweigert, E. (1938) "Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis", *Hesperia* 7: 264-310
- Schweitzer, B. (1931) "Dea Nemesis Regina", *JDAI* 46: 175-246
- Seaford, R. (1984) *Euripides: Cyclops*, Oxford 1984
- Seeberg, A. (1994) "*Epoiesen, egrapsen*, and the organization of the vase trade", *JHS* 114: 162-4

- Shanks, M. (1996) *Classical Archaeology of Greece: experiences of the discipline*, London and New York
- Shapiro, H.A. (1984) “*Ponos and Aponia*”, *GRBS* 25: 107-10
- Shapiro, H.A. (1986) “The origins of allegory in Greek art”, *Boreas* 9: 4-23
- Shapiro, H.A. (1989) *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens*, Mainz 1989
- Shapiro, H.A. (1990) s.v. “Homonoia”, *LIMC* V, 476-9
- Shapiro, H.A. (1993) *Personifications in Greek Art: The Representation of Abstract Concepts 600-400 B.C.*, Zurich
- Shapiro, H.A. (1995) “Attic Comedy and the ‘Comic Angels’ Krater in New York”, *JHS* 115: 173-5
- Shapiro Lapatin, K.D. (1992) “A family gathering at Rhamnous?”, *Hesperia* 61: 107-19
- Sharples, R.W. (1992) *Alexander of Aphrodisias: Quaestiones 1.1-2.15*, London
- Shear Jr., T.L. (1993) “The Persian destruction of Athens: evidence from Agora deposits”, *Hesperia* 62: 383-482
- Simon, E. (1964) “Die Wiedergewinnung der Helena”, *AK* 7: 91-5
- Simon, E. (1965) s.v. “Peitho”, *EAA* VI, 5-8
- Simon, E. (1970) “Aphrodite Pandemos auf attischen Münzen” *SNR* 49: 5-19
- Simon, E. (1983) *Festivals of Attica*, Wisconsin
- Simon, E. (1986) s.v. “Eirene”, in *LIMC* III, 700-5
- Simon, E. (1988) *Eirene und Pax: Friedensgöttinnen in der Antike (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J. W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Band XXIV, Nr.3)*, Stuttgart
- Sinn, U. (1993) “Greek sanctuaries as places of refuge”, in Marinatos and Hägg (eds.)
- Slatkin, L.M. (1991) *The Power of Thetis: allusion and interpretation in the Iliad*, Berkeley, etc
- Smith, A.C. (1997) *Political Personifications in Classical Athenian Art*, diss. Yale
- Smith, C.F. (1918) “Personification in Thucydides”, *CPh* 13: 241-50

- Smith (1998) "Reading Zoilos' marbles: the archaeology of a brilliant career", *Omnibus* 35 (January): 28-32
- Sobel, H. (1990) *Hygieia: die Göttin der Gesundheit*, Darmstadt
- Sokolowski, F. (1969) *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques*, Paris
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1985) *Aristophanes: Peace*, Warminster
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1987) "Myth as history: the previous owners of the Delphic Oracle", in Bremmer, J. (ed.) 215-41
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1991) *'Reading' Greek Culture: texts and images, rituals and myths*, Oxford
- Sparkes, B.A. (1996) *The Red and the Black: studies in Greek pottery*, London
- Spender, D. (1990) *Man Made Language*, 2nd ed. London
- Spiegel, N. (1990) *War and Peace in Classical Greek Literature*, Jerusalem
- Spivey, N. (1995) *Understanding Greek Sculpture*, London
- Stafford, E.J. (1991/3) "Aspects of Sleep in Hellenistic Sculpture", *BICS* 38: 105-20
- Stafford, E.J. (1997a) "Themis: religion and order in the archaic *polis*", in Mitchell and Rhodes (eds.), 158-67
- Stafford, E.J. (1997b) "A wedding scene? Notes on Akropolis 6471", *JHS* 117: 200-2
- Stafford, E.J. (1998) "Masculine values, feminine forms: on the gender of personified abstractions", in Foxhall and Salmon (eds.), 43-56
- Stafford, E.J. (1999a) "Plutarch on Persuasion", in Pomeroy (ed.)
- Stafford, E.J. (1999b) "Liverpool in person: Classical allegory and the Victorian city", Classical Association Conference, Liverpool, 8-11th April
- Stewart, A. (1997) *Art, Desire, and the Body in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge
- Stöbl, F. (1937) s.v. "Personifikation", *RE*² XIX.1, 1042-58
- Sutton, R.F. (1992) "Pornography and persuasion on Attic pottery", in Richlin, A. (ed.) 3-35
- Swain, S. (1996) *Hellenism and Empire: language, Classicism, and power in the Greek world AD 50-250*, Oxford
- Tanner, J.J. (1995) *The Invention of Art History: Religion, Society and Artistic Differentiation in Ancient Greece*, diss. Cambridge

- Taplin, O. (1993) *Comic Angels and other approaches to Greek drama through vase-paintings*, Oxford
- Taylor, T. (1792) *The Hymns of Orpheus* (facsimile repr. 1981), Los Angeles
- Thériault, G. (1996) *Le Culte d'Homonoia dans les cités grecques (Collection de l'Orient Méditerranéen N° 26, Série Épigraphique 3)*, Paris
- Thomas, R. (1989) *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge
- Thompson, H.A. (1937) "Buildings on the West Side of the Agora", *Hesperia* 6: 63-76
- Thompson, H.A. (1952) "The altar of Pity in the Athenian Agora", *Hesperia* 21: 47-82
- Thompson, H.A. (ed. 1976) *The Athenian Agora: a guide to the Excavation and Museum*, 3rd ed. Athens
- Thompson, H.A. and Wycherley, R.E. (1972) *The Athenian Agora XIV, The Agora of Athens: the History, Shape and Uses of an Ancient City Center*, Princeton
- Thornton, B.S. (1997) *Eros: the myth of ancient Greek sexuality*, Boulder, Colorado, and Oxford
- Touchette, L.-A. (1990) "A New Interpretation of the Orpheus Relief", *AA*: 77-90
- Travlos, J. (1971) *Pictorial Dictionary of Athens*, London
- Travlos, J. (1988) *Bildlexikon zur Topographie der antiken Attika*, Tübingen
- Trendall, A.D. (1989) *Red Figure Vases of South Italy and Sicily*, London
- True, M. (1985) "A New Meidian Kylix", *Greek Vases in the John Paul Getty Museum* II, 79-88
- Turpin, J.-Cl. (1980) "L' expression αἰδῶς καὶ νέμεσις et les 'actes de langage'", *REG* 93: 352-67
- Usener, H. (1896) *Götternamen*, Bonn
- Valk, M. van der (1959) review of Vos 1956, *Mnemosyne* 12: 144-7
- Vanderpool, E. (1974) "The 'Agora' of Pausanias I, 17, 1-2", *Hesperia* 43: 308-10
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1991) "Lore, learning and levity in the Sumerian disputations: a matter of form, or substance?", in Reinink, G.J. and Vanstiphout, *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Medieval Near East: Forms and Types of Literary Debates in Semitic and Related Literatures*, Leuven 1991

- Vermeule, C.C. (1981) *Greek and Roman Sculpture in America*, Berkeley, etc.
- Vernière, Y. (1980) “La famille d’Ananke”, in Duchemin (ed.), 61-8
- Versnel, H.S. (ed. 1981) *Faith, Hope and Worship*, Leiden
- Vessey, D.W.T. (1973) *Statius and the Thebaid*, Cambridge
- Veyne, P. (1988 [1983]) *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths? An essay on the constitutive imagination*, tr. Wissing, P., Chicago
- Vickers, M. and Gill, D.W.J. (1994) *Artful Crafts: ancient Greek silverware and pottery*, Oxford
- Vikelas, E. and Fuchs, W. (1985) “Zum Rundaltar mit archaistischem Götterzug für Dionysos in Brauron” *Boreas* 8: 41-8
- Voigt, F. (1937) s.v. “Peitho”, *RE*² XIX.1, 194-217
- Vos, H. (1956) *Themis*, Assen
- Wachsmuth, C. (1890) *Die Stadt Athen im Altertum* II, Leipzig
- Walker, S. (1979) “A sanctuary of Isis on the south slope of the Athenian Acropolis”, *ABSA* 74: 243-257
- Walton, A. (1894) *The Cult of Asklepios*, Ithaca, New York
- Warner, M. (1985) *Monuments and Maidens: the allegory of the female form*, London
- Waywell, G.B. (1986) *The Lever and Hope Sculptures*, Berlin
- Webster, T.B.L. (1949) *The Interplay of Greek Art and Literature* (inaugural lecture at University College London), London
- Webster, T.B.L. (1952a) “Language and Thought in Early Greece”, *Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, 94: 17-38
- Webster, T.B.L. (1952b) “Notes on Pollux’ list of tragic masks”, in *Festschrift Andreas Rumpf zum 60. Geburtstag, 1950*, Köln, 141-50
- Webster, T. B. L. (1954) “Personification as a mode of Greek Thought”, *JWCI* 17: 10-21
- Webster, T.B.L. (1974) *An Introduction to Menander*, Manchester
- Wees, H. van (1992) *Status Warriors*, Amsterdam
- Weiss, C. (1984) *Griechische Flussgottheiten in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, Würzburg

- Weizsäcker, P. (1909) s.v. "Peitho", in Roscher III.2, cols.1795-1813
- Weniger, L. (1902-9) s.v. "Themis", in Roscher, col. 570-606
- West, M.L. (1965) "The Dictaeon Hymn to the Kouros", *JHS* 85: 149-59
- West, M.L. (1966) *Hesiod's Theogony*, Oxford
- Whitby, M. (forthcoming) "An international symposium: Ion of Chios fr.27 and the margins of the Delian League", in Dabrowa, E. (ed.) *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean World (Papers presented to Prof. Wolski)*, Krakow
- Whitehead, D. (1986) *The Demes of Attica, 508/7-ca.250 BC: a political and social study*, Princeton
- Whitman, J. (1987) *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique*, Oxford
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1880) *Aus Kydathen, Philologische Untersuchungen I*, Berlin
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1931) *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, Berlin
- Wilhelm, A. (1940) "Themis und Nemesis in Rhamnus", *WJA* 32: 200-09
- Wilkins, J. (1993) *Euripides: Children of Herakles*, Oxford
- Willcock, M.M. (1970) "Some aspects of the gods in the *Iliad*", *BICS* 17: 1-10
- Willcock, M.W. (1981) "Ad Hoc Invention in the *Iliad*", *HSPH* 81: 41-53
- Williamson, M. (1990) *Some Problems of Literary Theory Considered with Particular Reference to the Interpretation of Pindar*, diss. London
- Winckelmann, J.J. (1766) "Attempt at an allegory" (selections from *Versuch einer Allegorie, besonders für die Kunst*) tr. in Irwin, D. (ed. 1972) *Winckelmann, Writings on Art*, London
- Winnington-Ingram, R.P. (1969) "Pindar's Ninth Pythian Ode", *BICS* 16: 9-16
- Wöhrle, G. (1995) *Hypnos, der Allbezwinger: eine Studie zum literarischen Bild des Schlafes in der griechischen Antike (Palingenesia 53)*, Stuttgart
- Wolters, P. (1891) "Zur Athena Hygieia des Pyrros", *MDAI(A)* 16: 153-65
- Woodford, S. (1986) *An Introduction to Greek Art*, London
- Worthington, I. (ed. 1994) *Persuasion: Greek rhetoric in action*, Routledge

- Wright, M.R. (1995) *Empedocles: the extant fragments*, Bristol
- Wycherley, R.E. (1954) "The Altar of Eleos", *CQ* 4: 143-50
- Wycherley, R.E. (1957) *The Athenian Agora III: Literary and Epigraphic Testimonia*, Princeton
- Wycherley, R.E. (1959) "Pausanias in the Agora at Athens", *GRBS* 2: 21-44
- Wycherley, R.E. (1963) "A Commentary on Pausanias 1.18", *GRBS* 4: 157-75
- Wycherley, R.E. (1978) *The Stones of Athens*, Princeton
- Yaguello, M. (1978) *Les Mots et les Femmes*, Paris
- Yates, F. (1966) *The Art of Memory*, London
- Zanker, P. (1990) *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, tr. Shapiro, A.H., Ann Arbor
- Zuntz, G. (1953) "The Altar of Mercy", *C&M* 14: 71-85
- Zuntz, G. (1955) *The Political Plays of Euripides*, Manchester